ISLAMIC ORTHODOXY AMONG THE OTTOMANS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE QĀḌĪ-ZĀDE MOVEMENT

Presented by

NECATİ ÖZTÜRK

Thesis submitted for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Edinburgh,
June, 1981.

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful

"And my success (in my task) can come only from Allah. In Him I trust, and unto Him I look."

To my father and mother

"The Lord hath decreed that ye worship none but Him, and that ye be kind to parents."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to all those who have assisted me in the preparation of this thesis. My gratitude to my supervisor, Mr. J.R. Walsh, who supervised this thesis until his retirement in June 1980. My special debt of gratitude goes to Dr. C. Hillenbrand, not only for her taking the responsibility of supervising this study but also for her painstaking help, encouragement and patience which brought this thesis to its present stage. My thanks also go to Dr. C.J. Kerslake for her checking the translation of the Turkish passages and for her criticisms and valuable comments. I should also thank Dr. ʿAbd al-Raḥīm ʿAlī for checking the translation of Arabic parts and his comments on several issues.

I should like to express my deep gratitude to my friends and colleagues, particularly Dr. İsmail Erünsal, Dr. Ummsalma M. Ṣāliḥ and Ṣ. Selim Has and the others who in one way or another contributed to this study.

I would like to express my gratitude to the Turkish Ministry of Education for providing me with a scholarship. My thanks also go to Edinburgh University and Father A. Ross for financial help in the last year of this study.

I should also like to thank the staffs of Süleymaniye Library, İstanbul University Library, Millet Library, Milli Kütüphane, Başbakanlık Arşivi, Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi, İstanbul Müftülüğü Şeriyye Sicilleri and the library of Dil, Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi. In particular,

I acknowledge the help of Dr. Yaṣar Koc̣ak of the Istanbul University Library and Dr. Meḥmed Tayṣi of Millet Library. My thanks also go to the staff of Edinburgh University Library, particularly Margaret Dowling and Jillian Jackson for their efficient service and help. My thanks also go to Mrs. O'Donnell for typing the manuscript of this thesis and Miss I. Crawford, secretary of the Department of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies for her help and kindness throughout my period of study.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my parents for their patience, my elder brother for his support, and my wife for her care, encouragement and moral support. Last, but not least my thanks to Allāh, subḥānahu wa taʿālā, who not only guided me to the right path, but also gave me patience and strength to overcome the problems and difficulties during the process of this study. "He is the best to protect and the Best helper."

ABSTRACT

This thesis treats in depth a hitherto little-known religious movement of seventeenth century Ottoman history, the Qāḍī-zāde movement. For its analysis, this study draws both on primary sources written in Arabic and Ottoman Turkish by the actual participants in this controversy and also on contemporary and near-contemporary historians who discuss the Qāḍī-zāde movement.

The first chapter offers a historical background to the movement and deals with relevant aspects of Ottoman society in the seventeenth century, paying particular attention to the moral and religious decline which had taken place. The second chapter presents a general account of the Ottoman *'ulamā'* and their role in the Ottoman state, with special reference to the seventeenth century. The third chapter is devoted to an analysis of Ottoman Ṣūfism and its place in the seventeenth century Ottoman society.

The fourth chapter discusses the origins of the Qāḍī-zāde movement and provides biographies of the movement's first leader and of his opponent, Siwāsī.

In the fifth chapter, an analysis of the second phase of the controversy is given and later leaders of the movement are discussed, whilst the sixth chapter deals with the third and final period of the movement and its aftermath and influence.

The seventh chapter covers in depth the controversial issues which formed the intellectual basis of the dispute between the Qāḍī-zādelis and their opponents, the Ṣūfīs.

The eighth chapter serves as a conclusion which offers an evaluation of the Qāḍī-zāde movement in the context of seventeenth century Ottoman society and discusses its implications for the long standing question of the definition of Islamic orthodoxy.

ABBREVIATIONS

ʻAṭāʼi	Ḥadāʼiq al-Ḥaqāʼiq fī takmilat al-Shāqāʼiq
Balance	G.L. Lewis, The Balance of Truth
Baltacı, Medreseler,	C. Baltacı, XV ve XVI Asırlarda Osmanlı Medreseleri
Belleten	Belleten (of Türk Tarih Kurumu)
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
CHI	Cambridge History of Islam
Danişmend, Kronoloji	I.H. Danişmend, İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi, 5 vols.,
Durar	ʻAbd al-Majīd Siwāsī, Durar al-aqāʼid
EI1	Encyclopaedia of Islam, first edition, 4 vols.
EI2	Encyclopaedia of Islam, second edition
GAL	Geschichte der Arabischen Literature and Supplements
Gibb-Bowen	H.A.R. Gibb and Harold Bowen, Islamic Society and the West
HʻA	al-Baghdādī, Ismāʻīl Pasha, Hadiyyat al-ʻArīfīn
HOP	E.J.W. Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry
İA	İslām Ansiklopedisi
IC	Islamic Culture
İFD	İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi
İİFD	Istanbul İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası
İJMES	International Journal of the Middle East Studies
İnalcık, Empire	H. İnalcık, The Ottoman Empire, classical age, 1300-1600

IQ	The Islamic Quarterly
IS	Islamic Studies
İT	İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiyye Teşkilātı
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
Kissling, Role	"The sociological and educational role of the dervishes in the Ottoman Empire"
KẒ	Hajji Khalīfa, Kashf al-Ẓunūn
KẒ Dh.	al-Baghdādī, Ismā'īl Pasha, Dhayl Kashf al-Zunun
Levendler	M. Cezar, Osmanlı Tarihinde Levendler
Lewis, Istanbul	B. Lewis, Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire
Mevlevilik	A Gölpınarlı, Mevlānādan sonra Mevlevilik
Mīzān	Ḥajji Khalifa, Mīzān al-Ḥaqq fī İkhtiyār al-Aḥaqq
Na'īmā	Na'īmā, Tārīkh
OM	Meḥmed Ṭahir, 'Othmānlı Mu'elli'fleri
OT	I.H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Tarihi
Pakalın	M.Z. Pakalın, Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü
Qāḍī-zāde, Irshād	Qāḍī-zāde, Meḥmed, Irshād al-'Uqūl
Shaw, Empire	S.J. Shaw, History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey
SI	Studia Islamica
SO	Meḥmed Thurayya, Sijillī 'Othmānī
Tekkeler	M. Kara, Tekkeler ve Zaviyeler
Trimingham, Orders	J.S. Trimingham, The Sūfī Orders in Islam
'Ushāqī-zāde	Ibrāhīm Ef. Dhayl Shaqā'iq

Ubicini	J.H. Abdolonyme, Letters On Turkey
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

The problem of transliteration in a thesis of this kind, which includes both Ottoman names and terms and also references to a large number of works in Arabic and to non-Ottoman Islamic scholars is highly complicated. The policy adopted here has been to follow the practice of the second edition of The Encyclopaedia of Islam, except that j is used in preference to dj and q is used instead of ḳ. In keeping with the practice of the Encyclopaedia, a single system of consonants has been applied in both non-Ottoman and Ottoman contexts, but in the latter, short vowels have been modified in order to conform more closely to Turkish pronunciation. Because of the difficulty, in many cases, of deciding into which category (Arabic or Ottoman), a word or phrase falls, no claim is made to complete consistency. In principle, however, one single form of transliteration has been maintained throughout for each individual term.

INTRODUCTION

As early as 1939 in his Türkiye Maarif Tarihi, Ergin in discussing the conflict between the representatives of the medrese and the tekke alludes to the movement which has become known by the name of its founder, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed (d. 1635). Ergin points out that no work has yet been written about this important phenomenon in the religious history of the Ottoman state in the seventeenth century.[1] Although so many years have passed since Ergin expressed this view, a view which was repeated thirty years later by another scholar, Kunt,[2] there have still been no attempts to analyse the Qāḍī-zāde movement and its place in the social history of this period.

The main reason for this neglect is probably the scant information given in the contemporary sources, most of which are in fact concerned only with the personality of the leaders of the movement. This dearth of detail makes the task of giving a comprehensive view of the movement itself all the more onerous. Indeed, from reading these accounts one would glean the impression that the movement was little more than a protracted controversy between two prominent shaykhs, each concerned with gaining fame for himself and winning the favour of the Sulṭān. Unfortunately,

---

1. O. Ergin, Türkiye Maarif Tarihi, (İstanbul, 1939), I, p. 198.
2. M. Kunt, The Köprülü Years, 1656-1661, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Princeton, 1971, pp. 6-7.

the work which apparently contained the fullest description of the movement, the History of Shārikh al-Manār-zāde Aḥmad (d. 1657)[3] is no longer extant, and only a bowdlerised summary of its contents is available in the work of Na'īmā (1655-1716)[4] which is the only near-contemporary historical source for the movement.

It is relevant at this point to mention Kātib Čelebi (d. 1656), who was not only a student of Qāḍī-zāde himself for some time, but also witnessed the whole controversy and knew the people who took an active part in it. Kātib Celebi's knowledge of the movement lasted, even after the deaths of Qāḍī-zāde (1635) and Siwāsī (1639), until the year 1656 when the movement reached its zenith. Unfortunately, Čelebi does not give a full account of the controversy, nor does he discuss the positions of the two sides, but he does provide limited information in his two works, the Fadhlaka[5] and the Mīzān al-Ḥaqq.[6] In the Fadhlaka the author gives some details on the life of Qāḍī-zāde and in this connection he also touches upon the controversy between Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī and some of the

---

3. L. Thomas, A Study of Naima, ed. N. Itzkowitz, (New York, 1972), pp. 136-9.

4. Idem, pp. 5-51.

5. Kātib Čelebi, Fadhlaka, (İstanbul, 1287), two vols.

6. Kātib Čelebi, Mîzanü'l Hakk fī İhtiyari'l Ahakk (İstanbul, 1972) (ed. O.Ş.Gökyay).

issues involved. In a few other places he mentions some incidents relevant to the dispute. His second work, Mīzān, is completely devoted to controversial issues in his own time and in one of its chapters he deals with the initial phase of the Qāḍī-zāde movement and treats the polemical questions involved. It is unfortunate that the author does not discuss the movement after the deaths of Qāḍī-zāde (1635) and Siwāsī (1639). He does, however, occasionally make comparisons between the Qāḍī-zādelis and Qāḍī-zāde himself. The observations of Kātib Čelebi are particularly valuable for an understanding of the general public's response to the controversy and its leaders.

The only extensive account of the movement, which treats it from its beginning and which also covers the activities of later leaders such as Wānī Meḥmed, is that of Na'īmā (d. 1716).[7] It is important to note that this author made use of the works of both Shārikh al-Manār-zāde and Kātib Čelebi when discussing the Qāḍī-zāde movement.[8] He treats the movement under the events of the year 1656 and begins with an introduction in which he outlines the history of the long-standing dispute between

---

7. Na'īmā, Tārīkh-i Na'īmā, (İstanbul, 1280), 6 vols.

8. Thomas, op. cit., pp. 132-6. It is not always possible to detect where Na'īmā took his information from. A useful discussion is in Thomas, pp. 129-145.

the orthodox *'ulamā'* and the Ṣūfīs.[9] He then gives a biography of Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī which is summarised from Kātib Čelebi. This is followed by a list of the controversial issues taken up by the movement and the activities of both shaykhs.[10] Na'īmā then outlines the development of the movement after the death of Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī, the growing influence and power of the Qāḍī-zādelis, the arrival and leadership of Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed, the attacks of the Qāḍī-zādelis on Ṣūfī *tekkes*, the Ṣūfīs' response to their opponents and finally Köprülü's banishment of the leaders of the Qāḍī-zādelis.[11] In his conclusion, Na'īmā cites a number of notorious stories about the Qāḍī-zādelis, in order to demonstrate their insincerity and hypocrisy.[12] He takes this information from Hüseyn Ma'ānoghlu (d. 1690) one of his verbal informants.[13] In general, Na'īmā's approach to the Qāḍī-zadelis and their ideas and activities is negative, even hostile, particularly in his selection of unfavourable anecdotes. This hostility may well be attributed to his probable affiliation to the Bektāshi order of dervishes,[14] who were denounced by the Qāḍī-zādelis.

---

9. Na'īmā, VI, pp. 218.

10. *Idem*, VI, pp. 219-20.

11. *Idem*, V, pp. 57-58.

12. *Idem*, VI, pp. 226-230.

13. Thomas, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-44.

14. Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 27. The author discusses the issue in detail.

Other contemporary historians of the seventeenth century, strangely enough, completely ignore the controversy and its impact on Ottoman society. Pečewi's[15] (1574-1650) history covers the period from the reign of Süleymān the Magnificent to the end of the reign of Sulṭān Murād IV. The author briefly mentions the famous shaykhs of the period of Murād IV such as 'Azīz Maḥmūd (d. 1623) and Siwāsī (d. 1639), as well as the introduction of coffee and tobacco, but he makes no reference either to the controversy or to Qāḍī-zāde who was as famous as Siwāsī and the other shaykhs of this period.

Another historian of this period, Meḥmed Khalīfa, in his Tarīkh-i Ghilmānī,[16] which covers the events between the years 1623 and 1664, describes the moral decline and corruption in society at that time. Surprisingly, he ignores the whole Qāḍi-zāde controversy and the people involved in it. For an author who is normally very careful to describe events in detail as an eyewitness, his omission of any account of the Qāḍi-zāde movement is remarkable.[17] The author of Rawḍat al-Abrār, A. Qara Čelebī-zāde (d. 1658), unlike other historians of this

---

15. İ. Pečewī, Tārīkhi Pecewī, (İstanbul, 1283), 2 vols.
16. M. Khalīfa, Tārīkh-i Ghilmānī (İstanbul, 1340).
17. There is little information about M. Khalīfa, therefore it is difficult to give any reason for his omission. For more detail, see A. Refīq's introduction to M. Khalīfa, Tārīkh-i Ghilmānī (İstanbul, 1340), pp. 3-6.

period, held positions in the government. He makes no mention of the Qāḍī-zāde controversy, although he mentions the appearance of tobacco and the death of shaykh Siwāsī. It seems as if he deliberately ignored the controversy on smoking and other issues during this period.[18]

In the eighteenth century Silāḥdār Meḥmed Agha (d. 1724), in his work known as Silāḥdār Tārīkhī, under the heading of "Waqa'-'i Qāḍī-zādeliler", discusses the movement after the appointment of Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha as Grand Vizier in 1656. He begins by introducing the Qāḍī-zādelis as "Ahl-sunna wa'l-jamā'a" and their leader as Qāḍī-zāde about whom he gives brief information and mentions his effort to forbid smoking in order to gain recognition. Then the author explains that they were against several issues which he numbers as four. He finally talks about the clash in the Fātiḥ mosque in 1656 between the Qāḍī-zādelis and their "opponents", about whom he does not give any specific information nor does he give a name to them. He mentions the expulsion of Üsṭüwānī and the other two Qāḍī-zādeli leaders from Istanbul to Cyprus. One aspect of this work is striking and surprising. The author presents a very one-sided view of the controversy and he does not refer to the Ṣūfīs explicitly at all.[19]

---

18. A. Qara Čelebi-zāde, Rawḍat al-Abrār (Bulaq, 1248), p.607.

19. M. Agha, Silāḥdār Tārīkhī, A. Refīq (ed) (İstanbul, 1923) I, pp. 57-9.

On the other hand, the historian Rāshid (d. 1735)[20] on several occasions refers to Wānī Meḥmed (d. 1685), his activities and influence over the Sulṭān and his eventual death. In this connection, he praises Wānī's eloquence and profound knowledge of <u>tafsīr</u>. Unlike Na'īmā, Rāshid does not accuse Wānī or the Qāḍī-zādelis of hypocrisy, but he criticises Wānī for his backbiting against state officials as well as for his uncontrolled language. This behaviour according to Rāshid played a very important part in reducing his popularity in the sight of the Sulṭān and other Palace officials.

In addition to the chronicles of this period, there are a number of biographical sources which provide a wealth of information about the individuals who were involved in the controversy. In this respect Tashköprü-zāde's <u>Shaqā'iq al-Nu'māniyya</u>,[21] its continuation by 'Aṭā'i, <u>Dhayl al-Shaqā'iq</u>[22] and 'Ushāqī-zāde's <u>Dhayl Shaqā'iq</u>[23] are especially noteworthy, as well as Shaykhī's

---

20. M. Rāshid, <u>Tārīkhī Rāshid</u> (İstanbul, 1282), 5 volumes, of which only the first two are relevant to this thesis.
21. Tashköprü-zāde, <u>Shaqā'iq al-Nu'maniyya</u>, (İstanbul, 1852). ?
22. 'Aṭā'i, <u>Ḥadā'iq al-Ḥaqā'iq fī Takmilat al-Shāqā'iq</u>, (İstanbul, 1851).
23. 'Ushāqī-zāde, <u>Dhayl Shaqā'iq</u>, J. Kissling (ed.) (Wiesbaden, 1965).

Vakā'i 'ü'l-Fużalā.[24] These authors generally held a favourable attitude to the famous people whose biographies they wrote. No unfavourable stories can be found in these sources. 'Ushāqī-zāde, who discusses all the individuals who took part in the Qāḍī-zāde controversy from the time of Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī down to the death of Wānī, mentions no pejorative stories about these people. On the contrary, he praises people like Üsṭüwānī and Wānī, because of their fine qualities and profound knowledge.[25] In addition to these, a work by Naẓmī Meḥmed which contains the life story of Khalwati Shaykhs, Hadiyyat al-Ikhwān[26] has also been consulted.

In the nineteenth century, the Ottoman historian B. Hüseyn (who wrote the Tārīkh-i Sülāle-i Köprülü,[27] a history of the Köprülü family) refers to the Qāḍī-zādelis when he discusses the first move of Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha (d. 1661) following his appointment to the Grand Vizierate.

---

24. A brief and good introduction to the biographies of the 'ulamā' in Ottoman literature can be found in A. Ugur, The Ottoman 'Ulamā in the Mid-17th Century; An Analysis of the Vakā'i 'ü'l-Fużalā of Meḥmed Seyhī Ef. unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh, 1973 2 vols.
25. 'Ushāqī-zāde, pp. 553, 569.
26. Naẓmī Meḥmed, Hadiyyat al-Ikhwān, İstanbul University Library, MS. Tyz, no. 1604.
27. Köprülü Library, İstanbul, MS. 212 (dated 1872).

The author takes all his information from Na'īmā without mentioning the source, so he adds nothing to what is already known.

Finally in this survey of primary sources, mention should be made of a Ṣūfī manuscript by Shaykh 'Abd al-Lāṭīf b. Muḥammad Es'ad, concerning the life and miracles of his grandfather, al-Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ghazzi,[28] who lived in Bursa during the reign of Meḥmed IV. The author mentions the disputes which took place in İstanbul between the Ṣūfīs and their opponents. This is a very valuable source, particularly for an understanding of the Ṣūfīs response to the prohibition of dhikr and samā' by the state. The author also discusses the influence of Wānī Ef. in İstanbul after his dismissal from his position in 1683 and mentions his death in 1685.[29]

Besides the primary Turkish sources, there are some western scholars who have been concerned with the Qāḍī-zāde movement and the individuals involved in the dispute. The seventeenth-century English diplomat Rycaut, in his work on the Ottoman state, presents the Qāḍī-zādelis as a new sect which sprang up among the Turks during the reign

---

28. Despite my extensive search, I was unable to find any information about the life story of Shaykh al-Ghazzi.
29. The only copy is with Shaykh Muzaffer Ozak, who very kindly allowed me to have a photocopy of the MS. which is dated 1297.

of Sulṭān Murād IV. He traces the origin of the sect to "one Birgali Efendi" and mentions that, during the period of Sulṭān Murād IV, they were popular and influential in the palace. The author also points out that the Qāḍī-zādelis were very vigilant in observing the rules of religion and punctilious in their rituals. Although the author is not very clear about the dogmatic claims of this group, he makes useful observations concerning their social position and influence.[30]

Another western writer who mentions the Qāḍī-zādelis and their disagreement with the Ṣūfīs is the early 19th-century historian, Von Hammer. The author provides all the information which was available to him from Ottoman chronicles, but he makes no attempt to analyse the movement. His contribution is therefore only that of compiling existing information. He does, however, have some inconsistencies in regard to dates.[31]

The few modern historians, both Turkish and western, who have written on the Qāḍī-zāde movement, have merely

---

30. Rycaut, The Present State of the Ottoman Empire, (London, 1668), pp. 128 and 130.

31. Von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, (Wien, 1829), V. idem, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman depuis son origine jusqu' à nos jours.., Tr. par. J.J. Hellert, (Paris, 1835-45) vols. X, XI, idem, Dawlati 'Othmānīya Tārīkhi, Tr. Meḥmed 'Aṭā (İstanbul, 1377), vol. X and Osmanli Devleti Tarihi, Tr. Mehmet 'Atâ. (İstanbul, 1947).

repeated the same data, using Na'īmā as their main source and drawing conclusions in accordance with his interpretation of the facts. Among these modern historians Uzunçarşılı is the only one who discusses the Qāḍī-zādelis systematically. In his well-known Ottoman history he has a section entitled "Sofiyye ricali ve Kadizadeliler". Here he makes a brief survey of the ṭarīqats in general and a few Ṣūfī orders in particular. He mentions a few famous Ṣūfī leaders and finally describes Ṣūfīsm in seventeenth-century Ottoman society. In order to discuss the Qāḍī-zādelis, he traces their origin to Birgiwī Meḥmed and presents Birgiwī's book al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya as a source of inspiration for the Qāḍī-zādelis. He uses Na'īmā and biographical sources for the movement and the people involved in it. He discusses the whole movement in a fairly balanced way, but generally regards the Qāḍī-zādelis as extremists of whom he does not approve.[32]

Two other Turkish scholars, Yurdaydın and Gölpınarlı have dealt with the Qāḍī-zādelis in their works. In one of his articles Yurdaydın mentions the Qāḍī-zādelis but

---

32. İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Tarihi, (Ankara, 1951), vol. III, part I, pp. 351-74. In a private conversation with Uzunçarşılı two months before his death in 1977 he expressed his feelings about the Qāḍī-zādelis. He said: "I like religious people: what I do not like are fanatics like the Qāḍī-zādelis, who confined religion to strict rules and principles."

adds nothing to our existing knowledge on the subject. In another article, however, he publishes the risāla of Üsṭüwānī, in order to demonstrate the approach of an important Qāḍī-zādeli figure both towards general questions and also on specific topics, such as raqṣ, music and shirk. This can be regarded as an important contribution to the knowledge of the Qāḍī-zāde movement.[33] Gölpınarlı, in his work on the Mawlawi dervish orders refers to Qāḍī-zāde, Üsṭüwānī and Wānī from the information found in Ottoman chronicles such as Na'īmā and Rāshid. He is the first author who mentions the Qaṣida of Qāḍī-zāde, whom he presents as a courageous, outspoken shaykh during a period of hard times. From the ideas in his Qaṣīda, Gölpınarlı considers Qāḍī-zāde to "be a Wahhābi in the Ottoman land." This scholar has an especially negative attitude towards Üsṭüwānī and Wānī.[34]

In English, two historians, İnalcık and Shaw, who deal with Ottoman history and institutions, mention the

---

33. H.G. Yurdaydın, "Türkiyènin dinī tarihine umumi bir bakış" in IFD, IX (1961), pp. 109-20.
Idem, "Üstüvanî Risālesi" in IFD, X (1962), pp. 71-8.
Idem, İslām tarihi dersleri, (Ankara, 1971), pp. 125-130.

34. A. Gölpınarlı, Mevlānādan sonra Mevlevīlīk, (İstanbul, 1963), pp. 157-60. The author is wrong to present Qāḍī-zāde as a pupil of Birgiwī since Birgiwī died at least ten years before Qāḍī-zāde was born.

Qāḍī-zādelis in their works. The former, in his well-known work on Ottoman history, deals with the classical period between the years 1300-1600. In the section entitled "The Triumph of Fanaticism" he refers to the Qāḍī-zādelis whom he considers to be narrow-minded preachers inspired by the ideas of Birgiwī. According to İnalcık, Birgiwī was an outspoken fanatic who objected to some common practices in Ottoman society and even attacked the ideas of the Shaykh al-Islām Abu 'l-Su'ūd, who defended some "fundamental institutions of Ottoman society" against this fanatic. Like most Turkish scholars, İnalcık considers Birgiwī and his ideas as the source of inspiration for the Qāḍī-zādelis, but he presents the latter as being more intolerant than their master Birgiwī. Above all, it is a pity that the author does not give any source at all for his information.[35]

In his well-known study of Ottoman history Shaw discusses the Qāḍī-zādelis and their ideas and approach. He wrongly presents Qāḍī-zāde and his followers as being among the "leading members of the 'ulamā'." Like the other modern scholars mentioned above, he regards them as fanatics who insisted on rigid acceptance of the Qur'ān and the sunna. He also accuses them of being against what he loosely calls "modernization", of acting inconsistently

---

35. H. İnalcık, Empire, pp. 183-5. The author repeats the same mistake as Gölpınarlı and states that Qāḍī-zāde was a student of Birgiwī.

with their ideals and resorting to anything to achieve their ends. Shaw's only source is Na'īmā; some of his conclusions, however, cannot be justified even on the basis of that one source.[36]

A recent work which discusses the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfis is a Ph.D. thesis by Şimşek entitled, Les Controverses sur la Bid'a en Turquie de Selim I à Meḥmed IV.[37] The author's main concern is bid'a and the controversies which surrounded it. He refers to Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī and their followers and presents Qāḍī-zādelis as the upholders of the ideas of Birgiwī. According to Şimsek, the Qāḍī-zāde movement was responsible for the emergence of the neo-Hanbalism which infiltrated Turkey after the conquest of Egypt. The author makes extensive use of Na'īmā and Uzunçarşılı in his discussion of the Qāḍī-zāde movement but he also draws on the risālas of Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī in discussing the important issues in the controversy.[38]

All the studies reviewed above consider the Qāḍī-zādelis as a group of fanatics who wanted to take advantage of the turmoil and decadence which confronted Ottoman society in the seventeenth century. It is clear, however, from the discussion above that no comprehensive

---

36. S. Shaw, Empire, pp. 206-7, 209. (The page references to Na'īmā given by Shaw are incorrect.)

37. M. Şimşek, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Sorbonne, 1977, Paris.

38. Idem, pp. 95-6, 58-61.

study of the Qāḍī-zāde movement yet exists.

The present study aims to fill that gap. It makes use of three types of source. Firstly, it draws on important first hand contemporary documents hitherto neglected by scholars, the risālās written by both sides in the Qāḍī-zāde controversy, some of which have fortunately survived until today. Although these writings do not deal with the historical development of the movement, they are certainly an invaluable source for an understanding and assessment of the intellectual aspects of the movement. In this thesis, the controversial issues of the Qāḍī-zāde movement will be studied on the basis of the information provided in these polemical writings of the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs.[39]

A second type of source material is provided by the works of the contemporary and later Ottoman historians mentioned above. The third type of source is provided by the qaṣīdas which were composed during the seventeenth century and describe Ottoman society at that time, suggesting solutions to its problems. These include the qaṣīdas of Waysī (d. 1618) and Qāḍī-zāde himself.[40]

---

39. The works are described in detail in chapters IV, V and VI.

40. See chapters I and IV.

During my six months' stay in İstanbul, in 1977, collecting material for this research, I consulted the records of the religious courts in İstanbul (Şer'iyye Sicilleri). Unfortunately the records which

A major contribution of this thesis will be to present, often for the first time in English, information contained in <u>risālas</u> and other first-hand sources written in Arabic or Turkish, many of which are still in manuscript form.

The sources refer to the members of the Qāḍī-zāde movement sometimes as "Qāḍī-zādeliler" (Qāḍī-zādelis) or "Faqiler" (Faqis). Throughout the thesis, for the sake of convenience they will be referred to as "Qāḍī-zādelis".

---

cover the reign of Sulṭān Murād IV have not survived. Thereafter the records for the reigns of Ibrāhīm and Meḥmed IV are not in good condition and contain no reference to the Qāḍī-zādelis or the Ṣūfīs. Similarly the <u>Mühimme Defterleri</u>, the official daily record of government business, yielded nothing on the Qāḍī-zāde movement, except some orders and decrees for prohibiting the cultivation and selling of tobacco.

CHAPTER I

THE OTTOMAN STATE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

A Summary of the Main Political Events in the Ottoman State in the Seventeenth Century

The last two decades of the sixteenth and the first two decades of the seventeenth centuries were a very difficult period for the Ottoman state because of great social, political and economic problems which left the state extremely debilitated. The era of Süleymān the Magnificent 927-974 (1520-1566) had witnessed the zenith of Ottoman power, in every aspect of social, political, cultural, economic and religious life.[1] This short-lived greatness was to end during the period of Süleymān's successors, who were unable to maintain what they inherited from their predecessor. It was during this period that the seeds of decline and corruption crept into the Ottoman state and society.[2]

In addition to grave problems outside their borders, and in particular conflicts both with Iran and the Hapsburgs[3] at this time, the Ottomans had even more serious domestic difficulties which no doubt contributed to their failure against both these external foes. Having concluded these two long wars with peace treaties (1590, 1606), the Ottomans turned their attention to internal problems which had come into existence as a result of

---

1. V.J. Parry, "The Reign of Sulaimān the Magnificent, 1520-66" in M. Cook ed. <u>A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730</u>, (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 79-102.
2. V.J. Parry, "The Successors of Sulaimān 1566-1617" in <u>idem</u>, pp. 103-32.
3. The war with Iran continued for several years (1578-1590); cf. B. Kütükoğlu, <u>Osmanlı İran Siyasī</u>

social and economic crises and political discontent.[4]

In different parts of the Ottoman territory, particularly in Anatolia, groups of brigands had appeared and had destroyed villages, property and crops. They had even dared to fight against the state and had on occasion defeated the government armies which had been sent against them.[5] When Sulṭān Aḥmad I came to the throne at the age of thirteen in 1603,[6] he immediately took measures to put down the rebels. Accordingly, in the summer of 1608 these rebels, who were generally known as "jalālīs",[7] were crushed by Quyuju Murād Pasha. Finally through these

---

Münasebetleri (İstanbul, 1962), pp. 142-98. The war with the Hapsburgs continued for 13 years and ended with the peace treaty of Zitvatorok in 1606. See İ. Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, part I, pp. 414, 421; S. Shaw, I,pp. 187-8.

4. M. Cezar, Osmanlı tarihinde levendler (İstanbul, 1965), pp. 147-69.

5. W.J. Griswold, Political Unrest and Rebellion in Anatolia, 1605-1609, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1966, University of California, Los Angeles, pp. 7-8; M. Akdag "Genel Çizgileriyle XVII. Yüzyil Türkiye Tarihi" in Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi, IV (1966), pp. 201-7.

6. C. Baysun, "Ahmed I" in İA, I, pp. 161-4; S. Mantran, "Aḥmad" in EI², I, pp. 267-8.

7. M. Akdāg, Celālī İsyanları (Ankara, 1963), pp. 1-3; idem, Büyük Celālī karışıklık larinin başlaması (Erzurum, 1963), pp. 1-3.

severe measures the rebels were brought to heel or they went underground.[8]

After the death of Aḥmad I in 1617 and the brief reign of his brother Muṣṭafā I,[9] ʻOthmān II came to the throne. The new ruler, although very young, showed that he dared to tackle the deteriorating situation within the Ottoman state and he began to take the necessary measures to delay the process of its decline.[10] His first aim was to abolish the janissary corps who with the Sipāhīs played an important role in the power politics of the state. But when his plans became known to the janissaries, they did not hesitate to depose him in 1032/1622.[11]

After a second unsuccessful attempt to rule by Muṣṭafā I, the Ottoman throne was then occupied by Murād Iv, son of Aḥmad I. Because of his extreme youth, control of state affairs was left in the hands of his mother,

---

8. Griswold, op. cit., pp. 9-12; C. Orhonlu, "Murad Paşa" in İA, VIII, pp. 651-54; Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, part I, pp. 102-117.

9. M. Aktepe, "Mustafa I", İA, VIII, pp. 692-5.

10. Ş. Altundağ, "Osman II", İA, IX, pp. 443-8; Shaw, op. cit., p. 190; Parry, op. cit., p. 134; A.H. De Groot, The Ottoman Empire and Dutch Republic (İstanbul, 1978), pp. 17-19.

11. Ş. Altundağ, op. cit., p. 438; M. Sertoğlu, "Tuği Tarihi" in Belleten (Ankara, 1947), pp. 386; Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, p. 146; Parry, op. cit., p. 134.

Wālide Kösem Sulṭān (d. 1651)[12] and others who had brought him to power in the palace. This situation was to continue until the year 1042/1632, when Murād IV took power into his own hands.[13] During this period, there were several serious internal rebellions, some of which were in protest against the murder of Sulṭān ʻOthmān II. The most threatening was the uprising of Abaza Meḥmed Pasha (1622-28) which occupied the state for some time.[14] In addition to these, there were a few military revolts in the western Ottoman provinces as well as in Anatolia as a result of the lack of centralised government control and because of maladministration. At the same time, Shah ʻAbbās I (1587-1629), who wanted to take advantage of the situation within the Ottoman state, conquered Baghdad in 1624.[15]

However, Sulṭān Murād, realizing the gravity of the situation, first engaged himself in the establishment of law and order in İstanbul and other parts of the Ottoman domain. He began with a ruthless purge of the Janissaries

---

12. C. Baysun, "Murad IV", in İA, VIII, pp. 625-47; also "Kösem Sultān", in İA, VI, pp. 915-23; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., p. 261.
13. Parry, op. cit., p. 144; Baysun, İA, VIII, p. 630; Shaw, op. cit., p. 194.
14. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 193, 195; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., pp. 155-7.
15. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 194-5; Parry, op. cit., p. 144; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., p. 163.

and Sipahīs who were creating havoc in the capital and flouting his authority. The Sulṭān quickly realized the origin of the problem and the people behind it. Hence, he put to death in 1632 the Grand Vizier Rajab Pasha,[16] who was the instigator of the recent troubles, and replaced him with Tabaniyassı Meḥmed Pasha.[17] The Sulṭān then held an Ayaq Dīwānī[18] in the Sinān Pasha Palace where he addressed the leaders of the Janissaries and Sipāhis. The Sulṭān's speech must have convinced the leaders of the soldiers who at the end signed a paper declaring their obedience to the Sulṭān's authority and undertaking not to help the rebels. Thereafter, the Sulṭān addressed the Qāḍīs whom he reminded not to indulge in corruption, bribery, nepotism or other malpractices. In turn the Qāḍīs expressed their opinion and made known that they had been coerced by the Sipāhīs. Finally, they also agreed to act together in order to fight against

---

16. I.H. Danişmend, Izahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi (İstanbul, 1971), V, p. 34; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., p. 192.

17. Danişmend, op. cit., III, p. 354; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., pp. 191-2; Parry, op. cit., p. 138.

18. The Ayaq Dīwānī would convene in emergency situations. To it would come government officials and the Sulṭān would preside over the meeting, at which everyone but himself would remain standing. See M.Z. Pakalın, Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü, (İstanbul, 1946), I, pp. 117-18.

corruption and other illegal practices and signed a paper.[19] It is obvious from this meeting that the soldiers, who were supposed to be the guardians of law and order, and the Qāḍīs, who were in charge of the courts and responsible for the designation of religious functionaries, were charged with bribery, nepotism and other sorts of corruption.

When the Sipahīs and some of the Janissaries did not accept the resolutions of this meeting, Sulṭān Murād sought an excuse to rid himself of these rebels. This opportunity came on 27 Ṣafar 1043 (2 September 1633),[20] when a big fire broke out in the capital. Although tobacco-smoking was not the cause of the fire, the Sulṭān forbade the practice and closed down all the coffee-houses where people used to gather and smoke as well as drink coffee. This occurred on 12 Rabīʿ I 1043 (16 September 1633).[21] The punishment for not obeying the order was the death sentence. This policy was supported by Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed Ef. (d. 1635), who in order to gain the Sulṭān's favour declared that smoking was <u>ḥarām</u>[22] and

---

19. Naʿīmā, III, p. 317; M. Cezar, <u>Levendler</u>, p. 126; Uzunçarşılı, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 192-4.
20. Naʿīmā, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 157; Baysun, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 630.
21. Naʿīmā, III, p. 160; Baysun, <u>ibid</u>.
22. <u>Ḥarām</u> is defined as "an action punishable by law." See T. Izutsu, <u>Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur'ān</u>, (Montreal, 1966), p. 237.

that anyone who would not act in accordance with the law would be killed.[23] Although this tough and ruthless measure was taken against smokers in general, its main target was those rebels who were responsible for the disturbances and insecurity in the capital. Since the Sulṭān already knew that most of the Sipāhīs and Janissaries were addicted to smoking, he was well aware that by issuing this law he was putting the rebels in a difficult position. According to the sources, he succeeded in his aims and silenced all the trouble-makers.[24]

In general, Sulṭān Murād's tough and sometimes ruthless measures re-established law and order and brought back stability to the Ottoman state.[25] Thus he managed to arrest temporarily the process of Ottoman decline. His short but successful reign came to an end on 15 Shawwāl 1049 (8 February, 1640).[26]

Murād IV was succeeded by his brother Sulṭān İbrāhīm (1615-1648) on 16 Shawwāl 1049 (9 February 1640).[27] The

---

23. Cf. below, p. 321.
24. Na'īmā, III, p. 163; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., p. 197; Parry, op. cit., p. 148; Baysun, p. 630.
25. Danişmend, op. cit., III, pp. 377-83; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., pp. 208-10, 212; Baysun, op. cit., pp. 634-5.
26. Baysun, op. cit., p. 644; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., p. 212.
27. Gökbilgin, "İbrāhīm" in IA, V, pp. 880-85; Shaw, op. cit., p. 200.

new Sulṭān, because of his incompetence, could not build on the foundations laid down by his predecessor. Real power lay with the Wālide Sulṭān, khāssakīs (the consorts who had borne the Sulṭān a male child) [28] and others. These included Jinji Khwāja (d. 1648)[29] and his allies who, through their influence controlled important posts and became very rich by bribery.[30] Predictably, old problems manifested themselves in this situation. The administration was badly run, whilst the suffering of the ordinary people increased day by day because of the heavy taxation necessary to finance the extravagant life-style of the Sulṭān himself and his household.[31]

Finally Sulṭān İbrāhīm was deposed in favour of his young son Meḥmed IV (1642-1693) on 18 Rajab 1058/7 August 1648.[32] The period 1648-1651 was known as the "Aghālar

---

28. See Pakalın, op. cit., I, pp. 752-3; Alderson, Structure of the Ottoman Dynasty (Oxford, 1956), p.80
29. Gökbilgin, op. cit., p. 882.
30. Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., p. 230.
31. Shaw, op. cit., p. 200; Gökbilgin, op. and loc. cit. A. Refīq, Samūr Dewri (İstanbul, 1927).
32. C. Baysun, "Meḥmed IV", İA, VII, pp. 547-57; A.N. Kurat, "The Reign of Mehmed IV" in Cook, op. cit., pp. 157-177; M. Khalīfa, Tārīkhī Ghilmānī, (İstanbul, 1340), p. 23.

Saltanate" (Sultanate of the Aghas).[33] Until 1656, the country and government affairs were in a state of confusion and panic. On the one hand, the protracted war with Venice over Crete, begun in 1644, continued, and the Venetians blockaded the Dardanelles in 1648, even threatening the capital itself.[34] On the other hand, the Jalālīs maintained their activities and provoked disturbances in Anatolia. Moreover, the Janissaries frequently instigated revolts against the central authority and influenced government policy through their Aghās (commanders), who were powerful in the Palace.[35]

It was during this period of confusion and anarchy that, according to Naʻīmā, the Qāḍī-zādelis, under the leadership of Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed (d. 1661), who had won the favour of the Sulṭān and of his tutor, Reyḥān Aghā,[36] as

---

33. Agha (chief, master) was a title given to (1) the black and white eunuchs in the Palace service, and (2) certain other persons in government service, particularly commanders of military corps, e.g. yeniče̊ri aghas, H. Bowen, "Agha" in EI[2], I, p. 246.
34. Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, part I, pp. 258-62; Shaw, op. cit., pp. 203-5; Baysun, op. cit., pp. 549-50.
35. Rycaut, op. cit., pp. 9, 12-15; Baysun, loc. cit. Shaw, op. cit., p. 206.
36. Cf. chapter V below.

well as of the Wālide Sulṭān, took full advantage of the situation.[37] Beginning during the last years of Ibrāhīm's reign and continuing through the early years of Meḥmed IV, Üsṭüwānī acquired great influence over lowly Palace servants, such as the "Gardeners"[38] (Bostancılar) and Doorkeepers (Qapıcılar), as well as more important palace officials such as the black eunuchs. These elements in the palace attended his sermons or those of his followers and were moved by them. Üsṭüwānī became recognized as the shaykh of the Sulṭān and could thereby meddle in appointments at court. By offering positions to his own supporters and to those who gave the highest bids, Üsṭüwānī and some of his followers became very rich.[39]

Üsṭüwānī and his followers, who are generally known as the Qāḍī-zādelis, presented themselves as the champions of orthodoxy, opposing every sort of bid'a (innovation) and declaring the Ṣūfīs to be heretics and innovators. They therefore attacked the Ṣūfī tekkes and condemned Ṣūfī practices. They became increasingly intolerant towards those who did not share their views.[40]

---

37. Na'īmā, V, pp. 54-7; also, Rycaut, op. cit., pp. 11-15.
38. Uzunçarşılı, "Bostandji" in EI[2], II, pp. 127-8.
39. Na'īmā, loc. cit.; Shaw, op. cit., p. 207; cf. chapter V below
40. For more detail see chapter III.

When Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha (1575-1661) was appointed as Grand Vizier on 24 Dhi-l-qaʻde 1066 (14 September 1656)[41] it was hoped that he would save the country from its state of confusion. Köprülü knew well the situation of the government and in fact accepted the office only on certain conditions imposed by him. These were granted to him by the Sulṭān's mother, Turkhān Sulṭān (1683),[42] and he then accepted the post.[43]

The first move of the new Grand Vizier was the elimination of the Qāḍī-zādelis who, under the leadership of Üsṭüwānī, wanted to create a clash with the Ṣūfīs in the Fātih Mosque on the Friday following Köprülü's appointment. After consulting the ʻulamāʼ and receiving their approval, he exiled the Qāḍī-zādeli leaders such as Üsṭüwānī and Türk Aḥmad, and saved the realm from this intolerant, narrow-minded group. At the same time, he took similar steps against the Ṣūfī orders.[44] He then

---

41. T. Gökbilgin, "Köprülüler", in İA, VI, pp. 892-908; A. Refīq, Köprililer, (İstanbul, 1331), pp. 29-30; M. Kunt, The Köprülü Years, 1656-1661, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Princeton, 1971, pp, 50-61; B. Ḥüseyn, Tārīkh-i Sülāle-i Köprülü, MS. Köprülü Lib. (İstanbul) no. 212, fol. 8-11; Naʻīma, VI, pp. 213-4; M. Kunt, "Naʻīmā, Köprülü and the Grand Vezirate" in Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi, (İstanbul, 1973), I, pp. 57-64.
42. İ. Parmaksızoğlu, "Mehmed IV" in Türk Ansiklopedisi (Ankara, 1976), XXIII, p. 397.
43. Kunt, op. cit., p. 57; Shaw, op. cit., pp. 208-9.
44. Naʻīmā, VI, p. 217; Shaw, op. cit., p. 209. A full discussion will be given in chapter V.

began to re-establish law and order and to suppress revolts by a series of tough measures inside the capital. Once stability was established in Istanbul, he turned his attention to the other problems.[45] In the eastern provinces he dealt particularly with the revolt of Ḥasan Pasha (d. 1659).[46]

This energetic, tough vizier restored order to a certain extent within the Ottoman state. After his death in 1072 (1661), he was succeeded by his son, Köprülü Fāḍil Aḥmad Pasha (1635-1676), who was appointed Grand Vizier in the same year.[47] He remained in the office until his death in 1676, and successfully maintained the system which had been restored by his father.[48]

Fāḍil Aḥmad Pasha was succeeded by his foster-brother, Qara Muṣṭafā Pasha in 1676. It was during his time of office that the Ottomans made their second unsuccessful

---

45. Kunt, op. cit., pp. 70-80; Shaw, op. cit., pp. 210-11; A.N. Kurat, op. cit., pp. 164-5; Gökbilgin, op. cit., p. 695.

46. Kunt, op. cit.,pp. 82, 94-116; Gökbilgin, op. cit., pp. 696-7; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., pp. 394-409.

47. F. Babinger, "Köprülüler", in EI[1], II, pp. 1059-62; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., pp. 329-31; Kurat, op. cit.; Gökbilgin, op. cit., p. 987; Shaw, p. 211.

48. N. Itzkowitz, Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition, (New York, 1972), p. 81.

attack on Vienna, culminating in withdrawal in September 1683. The Grand Vizier was put to death a few weeks later.[49] It is significant to note that Wānī Meḥmed, the third leader of the Qāḍī-zādelis, who had served as an army preacher on this campaign, was removed from his post when the troops reached Edirne. It was at this point that Wānī Meḥmed lost his popularity at court and with the people and the influence of the Qāḍī-zāde movement dwindled.[50]

---

49. M. Aktepe, "Muṣṭafā Paşa" in İA, VIII, pp. 736-8. See also T. Barker, Double Eagle and Crescent, Vienna's Second Turkish Siege and Its Historical Setting, (New York, 1967).
50. Cf. chapter VI below.

Ottoman State and Society in the Seventeenth Century

In order to evaluate the importance of the Qāḍīzāde movement it is essential to study the society in which this movement arose. When seventeenth-century Ottoman society faced decline as well as new challenges from within and outside, certain intellectuals and statesmen who were concerned about the future of the state and of society itself wrote risālas and tracts. Their aim was to explain the mistakes and shortcomings of the existing system in comparison with the previous one which had made the Ottomans strong and successful.[51] In addition, there

---

51. B. Lewis, "Ottoman Observers of Ottoman Decline" in IS, I (1962), pp. 71-8; reprinted in idem, Islam in History (London, 1978), p. 199 T. Gökbilgin, "XVII Asırda, Osmanlı Devletinde İslahat İhtiyaç ve Temayülleri ve Kātip Çelebi" in Kātib Çelebi Hayatı Eserleri (Ankara 1957), pp. 197-218. Also A.S. Tveritinova, "Social Ideas in Turkish Didactic Politico-Economic Treatises of the XVI-XVIIth Centuries" in papers presented by the USSR delegation to the XXVth International Congress of Orientalists, (Moscow, 1960) pp. 402-409; R. Murphey, "The Veliyyuddin Telhis : Notes on the sources and interrelations between Koçi Bey and contemporary writers of advice to kings", in Belleten, vol. 43 (1979), pp. 547-71.

were some men of religion, who were aware of the problems of their society and the sufferings of their people, and expressed their complaints to the ruler of the day either in the form of a qaṣīda or in that of a risāla. Their approach to such problems was religious, as also was the solution they proposed. It is therefore evident that these qaṣīdas and risālas have great significance in any analysis of the religious and moral life of Ottoman society in this century. It appears that the first of such qaṣīdas was written by ʿAbd al-Majīd Siwāsī (d. 1639). This is said to have been presented to Sulṭān Aḥmad I (d. 1617).[52] The second was composed by the opponent of Siwāsī, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed, and was presented to Sulṭān Murād IV.[53] There is another qaṣīda by the poet Waysī who discussed a theme similar to that of the previous two qaṣīdas.[54]

The decline of the Ottoman state has received its due attention from contemporary authors in the seventeenth century as well as from modern scholars, whether Turkish

---

52. Z. Hayran, who published Siwāsī's Risālat al-Qaḍā wa-l-Qadar, mentions this qaṣida and even gives a summary of it in prose. Surprisingly, he does not give any source for the material he quotes. Z. Hayran, Kaza ve Kader Risalesi (Sivas, n.d.), p. 19.
53. Cf. the discussion in chapter IV.
54. J.W. Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, (London, 1904) III pp. 207

historians such as H. İnalcık,[55] M. Akdağ[56] and M. Cezar,[57] or westerners such as B. Lewis[58] and S. Shaw.[59] All these authors deal with the social, economic and political causes and effects of this decline, but they pay very little or no attention to the religious and moral aspects of such a decline. In this work an attempt will therefore be made to investigate closely the moral and religious aspects of Ottoman decline, while its social, political and economic features will be summarised from the works of the above-mentioned authors.

The decline of the Ottoman state and disintegration of Ottoman society may be treated under three main headings: government, economic and social life and religious and moral life. As regards government decline the risāla of Qoči Beg[60] is an original tract which was written in

---

55. H. İnalcık, The Ottoman Empire; Conquest, Organization and Economy, (London, 1978), section XIII.
56. M. Akdağ, Celāli İsyanlari (Ankara, 1963).
57. M. Cezar, Levendler (İstanbul, 1965).
58. B. Lewis, The Emergence of Modern Turkey (Oxford, 1961) pp. 21-41.
59. S. Shaw, History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey (Cambridge 1977), I, pp. 169-207.
60. Qoči Beg presented his risāla to Sulṭān Murād IV in 1040/1630. In his risāla he analyses the causes of Ottoman decline and suggests solutions. More detail, see Lewis, op. cit., pp. 203-7; Imber, "Qoči Beg" in EI², V, pp. 248-9.

the seventeenth century and is a valuable source. According to Qoči Beg the decline in government may be attributed to several causes, the first and the most important of which was the withdrawal of the Sulṭāns from direct control of state affairs. The Sulṭāns did not even attend the Dīwān personally. The Grand Viziers had lost power and Palace officials and favourites of the Sulṭān interfered in state matters.[61] Bribery played an important role in promotions and dismissals. The timar system was undermined. There was a rapid large increase in the number of Janissaries through the enrolment of individuals who paid bribes.[62]

Qoći Beg's remedy for the ills of the government was simply to remove corruption by restoring the sharī'a and qānūn to their previous status. His main aim was to return to the era of Süleymān I. He therefore proposes the removal of bribery by restoring the independence of the Grand Vizier, and by preventing favourites from wielding power. Officials should be able to remain in post without fear of unjust dismissal and timars should be offered only to worthy people.[63]

In fact, Qoći Beg's risāla resembles an earlier

---

61. Imber, ibid.; Shaw, op. cit., pp. 290-1.
62. Z. Danışman, Koçi Bey Risālesi (İstanbul, 1972), pp. 20, 32, 41, 71.
63. Imber, op. cit., p. 249; Shaw, op. cit., p. 291.

observation of Ottoman decline by the unknown author of Kitāb-ı Müsteṭāb.[64] According to both authors, the first fundamental weakness in the Ottoman state of the seventeenth century was lack of a strong central authority and, more especially, of powerful, confident, well-educated and experienced rulers. By the beginning of the seventeenth century four Ottoman Sulṭāns had come to the throne when they were still children and were not fit for their office.[65] The lack of leadership affected other government institutions, such as the military, which was a vital element for the survival of the Ottoman state. It was during this period that there was a lack of discipline and training. By this time most of the members of the qapiqulu sipāhīs and some of the janissaries had begun to marry and even to be involved

---

64. Kitāb-ı Müsteṭāb, ed. Y. Yücel (Ankara, 1974). The book is very important and interesting. It deals with the same issues as Qoči Beg; it is not impossible that Qoči Beg knew the book.

65. Aḥmad I (1603-17) and ʿOthmān II (1618-22) were fourteen, Murād IV (1623-40) was hardly twelve, Meḥmed IV (1648-87) was only seven. Excessive youth was not, however, the only factor making seventeenth-century Sulṭāns unfit for government. Muṣṭafā I (1618-22) was mentally disturbed, İbrāhīm (1640-48) was mad.

in commerce, and thus were neglecting their military training. Military campaigns met with defeat and retreat. This certainly affected the state treasury, and military campaigns became a financial burden.[66]

Corruption and bribery were also visible in the legal and educational institutions. According to the sources, bribery was so widespread that there was no office in which it was not practised in one way or an other.[67]

Several causes may be adduced for the emergence of social and economic difficulties. First of all, there was a rapid rise in the population of the Ottoman state, particularly in Anatolia.[68] Now that the conquests had ceased, the government could no longer maintain its deportation policy which had sent the excess population to the newly conquered provinces.[69] Instead, there was

---

66. Qoči Beg, Risāla, chapters III, IV, VII, VIII; Cezar, op. cit., pp. 144-170; B. Lewis, "Some Reflections on the Decline of the Ottoman Empire", in SI, IX, (1958).

67. Qoči Beg, Risāla, pp. 63-5; A. Mumcu, Osmanlı Devletinde Rüşvet (Ankara, 1965), pp. 187-207, 209, 240.

68. M.A. Cook, Population Pressure in Rural Anatolia, (London, 1972), p. 30. See also Y. Yücel (ed.) Kitab-ı Müsteṭāb, introduction, VIII; Cezar, op. cit., pp. 79-86.

69. Ö.L. Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir iskān ve kolonizasyon metodu olarak Sürgünler" in İİFM, XV (1953), pp. 209-37.

widespread emigration to urban centres where people could feel more secure. The villages and countryside were attacked by rebels, groups of brigands, lewends[70] and some of the medrese students (sūkhte) who robbed and destroyed properties and murdered people.[71]

The Ottoman economy, on the other hand, was confronted with great financial difficulties vis-à-vis the European economy. The influx of gold and silver from America gave Europe a superiority over the Ottomans. Within the Ottoman state high prices, inflation and devaluation of the currency resulted. This situation caused frequent uprisings on the part of the Janissaries and the common people. This process naturally affected the timar[72] system of the state, as İnalcık demonstrates

---

70. The word lewend originally referred to sailors and fighting men employed in the Ottoman navy, but from the second half of the sixteenth century it acquired the meaning of vagabond, rascal. See J.H.Kramers "Lewend" in EI[1], III, p. 24. Cezar, op. cit., p. 191.

71. M. Akdağ, "Türkiye tarihinde içtimāī buhranlar serisinden : Medreseli isyanlari" in İİFM, XV (1950), pp. 361-87

72. B. Lewis, "Ottoman Decline" in SI, IX (1958), pp. 119-124; Z.Y. Herschlags Introduction to the Modern Economic History of the Middle East (Leiden, 1964) pp. 7-8. O.L. Barkan, "Timar" in İA, XII, pp. 287-333; S. Turner, Weber and Islam, (London, 1974), pp. 130-2

in detail.[73] The other set-back which exacerbated Ottoman economic decline was the diversion of much of the Eastern trade to the Atlantic route.[74]

The religious and moral factors which played an undeniable role in the degeneration of the Ottoman state and disintegration of Ottoman society have not been studied thoroughly though their importance and influence on the life of the community cannot be underestimated. The origin of the moral degeneration and religious laxity in Ottoman society can be traced back as early

---

73. "The situation was not only the underlying cause of the military rebellions at the centre but also of the attempts by military groups in the provinces to squeeze more money out of the reaya. Timar holders whose incomes had been cut in half were so impoverished that they were unable to make their way to the battlefields of the Hungarian and Iranian wars and were instead robbing the reaya, avoiding campaigns and abandoning their holdings. Commanders and judges were resorting to bribes and abuses in order to hold their incomes level in the face of ever more costly living conditions." Op. cit., pp. 348-9. Qoči Beg, pp. 32-7, 41-54.

74. De Groot, op. cit., (İstanbul, 1978), p. 10.

as the beginning of the sixteenth century, to the reign of Sulṭān Selīm I (1512-1520). A certain ʿAli b. ʿAbd al-Karīm Khalīfa wrote a report which was presented to Sulṭān Selīm. In it he pinpointed the moral degeneration, religious laxity and widespread immorality which he saw in Ottoman society. Fornication, sodomy, usury, drinking alcohol and the like could be seen at every level of society.[75] Sometime later, Birgiwī Meḥmed (d. 1572) raised his voice in protest against increasing moral decline. He even undertook a journey to Istanbul to ask the Grand Vizier Soqullu Meḥmed to bring an end to this undesirable trend.[76]

The seventeenth-century historian Meḥmed Khalīfa, writing about contemporary events, describes the moral standard which prevailed in the year 1042 (1632) as follows:

> "At that time there was so much insubordination of the qul (the soldiers[77]) that they were[78] taking naked women in bath towels out of the

---

75. The report is given in S. Tansel, Yavuz Sultan Selim, (Ankara, 1969), pp. 21-27.

76. A. Aynī, Türk Ahlakçıları (İstanbul, 1939), p. 108.

77. I.e. members of the standing army (qapiqulları).

78. The syntax of this long sentence is so corrupt that I have been obliged to take some liberty with it in order to make an intelligible translation.

hammām in broad daylight, smoking in the Sulṭān Meḥmed (Fātiḥ) mosque on the day when they received ghulāmiyya,[79] trampling under foot the honour of Muslims, openly committing fornication and sodomy standing up in corners, shedding blood, raiding houses and palaces, and on festival days setting up a swing and calling the Sulṭān himself and his mother and the viziers and the members of the Dīwān to the swing with their candles; more especially, they were committing illegal actions in the coffee-houses and taverns. [All this had reached] such a pitch that the world had lapsed from order and regularity to an indescribable degree. The enemy also appeared at this point and the province of Yemen was lost. On the other frontiers the enemy was continually plundering the provinces. While the world was in such a state of disorder, the Holy Creator, who had not given his sacred approval [to this], set Sulṭān Murād to attack the mischief makers, in order to eradicate them. The Sulṭān for his part, inspired by God and in order to protect the imperial honour of the Ottoman State, drew the sword of warning and killed Rajab Pasha, the cause of the disorder created by the Janissary corps."[80]

---

79. In the latter part of the sixteenth century the ghulāmiyya was the remuneration paid to those qapiqulu sipāhīs who were entrusted with the collection of certain taxes. After 1603, however, it seems to have become an additional payment made to all qapiqulu sipāhīs. See Uzunçarşılı, Kapıkulu Ocakları (Ankara, 1944), II, pp. 157-61.

80. M. Khālifa, Tārīkh-i Ghilmānī (İstanbul, 1340), p. 13.

Meḥmed Khalīfa does not record any reaction to this behaviour on the part of the common people. Probably they were either afraid of the soldiers or they condoned such actions on the part of the soldiers who were supposed to be upholders of law, order and public safety.

Meḥmed Khalīfa was not the only writer who described immorality in the Ottoman capital. Two other authors expressed similar misgivings about moral standards and presented their views in the form of qaṣīdas to Sulṭān Murād IV. The first of these qaṣīdas was composed by the well-known poet Waysī (d. 1627-8). This qaṣīda, as pointed out by Gibb, gives a vivid picture of seventeenth-century Ottoman society in Istanbul. The work is entitled "Naṣīḥat-ı Islāmbol", and although addressed to the people of the capital, is clearly aimed at the Sulṭān himself.

"Ye build the earthly house, and ye lay waste the
mansion of the Faith:
Nor Pharaoh built nor Sheddad reared aloft such
house as this, by God!
I know not what your Faith may be, or what your
creed (God save us) is:
It holds not with the Imāms' words, nor chimes
with the Four Books of God.
Alike with sermons of the preachers and with
lectures of the Imāms,
Were there no fees paid down to them, ne'er would
be read the Word of God
The Pashas and the Aghas 'tis who turn the whole
world upside down;
'Tis they beyond a doubt who everywhere bring
anarchy and feud.
But yet more tyrannous than these, my Lord, the

Qāḍī ʻAskers are;
For now through bribery they've given o'er the world to wrack, by God!
Ye follow not the Law of God, nor yet obey the canon law;
With those new-fangled tricks you've given o'er the world to wrack by God!
'The fish stinks from the head' they say; the head of all this woe is known;
Ah me, could any might declare hereof: This is the Book of God?
The sheykhs and preachers walk no more along the straight and narrow path;
Accounting these as guides, what should the folk but stray and miss the road?
Alack, the Ṣūfīs fill the mosques with horrid howls and yells alone;
Ah, where the litanies and chants, and where the whispered call on God?
The hypocrites now hold the earth, they deem the whole world is their spoil;
But yet in many a nook concealed there bideth still a saint of God."[81]

It is clear that Waysī in this extract even dares to point to the origin of this social and moral corruption. He lays the ultimate blame at the door of those who held positions of power in the state.

The second qaṣīda was composed by Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed (d. 1045/1635) and presented to Sulṭān Murād IV in 1040 (1630). This qaṣīda will be studied in detail in a later chapter, but it may be useful to mention here the main

81. E.J.W. Gibb, HOP, III, pp. 214-18.

religious and moral issues which the author wanted to reach the ears of the Sulṭān. In his work Qāḍī-zāde in a manner very similar to that of Waysī, describes the political and social conditions of his time. He relates how villages have been burnt, and he describes the prevalent social unrest and insecurity. Moreover, he continues, soldiers have ceased to do their job properly, preferring to indulge in commerce, and military campaigns have resulted in failure. The main blame for the disruption of social stability should be attributed, according to Qāḍī-zāde, to the state officials who are corrupt and venal. The principles of religion are no longer observed and immorality, corruption and a luxurious life-style are common amongst the rich and the notables.

> "Awake from the sleep of heedlessness, O House of 'Othman; take note.
> Open your eyes [or] the throne of Süleymān will slip out of your hands; take note.
> The people of Istanbul are enjoying themselves in every corner;
> The provinces have filled up with all the sighs and wailings: take note.
> Many a woman have they abducted and many a virgin have they deflowered
> They have ransacked their possessions: take note.
> Disorders have broken out on every side and many injustices have occurred.
> The true believers are not able to suppress them: take note.
> The richest members of the military have become shopkeepers
> They certainly do not want the officially-fixed price; the measure has been tampered with:

take note.
The appointment of a person to office does not
happen through the proper channels;
All the <u>millet</u>[82] have gathered and shown
insubordination: take note.
All the notables and the influential people have
been overcome by women;
Women have embarked upon many kinds of innovations:
take note.
Wine-drinking and sodomy have spread widely in the
world;
Most of those who commit these acts are leading
figures and notables: take note.
All the mischief-makers and liars have become
preachers;
They are transmitting lies and slanders from
the pulpits: take note.
Your Pashas do not hold Beyler beyliks [even]
for a year;
On rapidly losing office they rebel: take note.
For that reason your command does not last for
a year
Those who have obtained positions with money have
come out in revolt: take note.
If you do not make yourself informed about the
conditions of this world
Riḍwān[83] will not open for you the gate of
Paradise: take note."[84]

---

82. Before the 19th century <u>millet</u> meant "religious community", pre-eminently the Muslim community.

83. Riḍwān, the angel who opens the door of Paradise in the Hereafter.

84. This <u>qaṣīda</u> and its implications will be studied more fully in chapter IV, pp. .

The author ventures to warn the Sulṭān about his duties to Allah and responsibilities to his subjects. He asks the Sulṭān to follow the Qur'ān and sunna in order to stop this trend. He also urges the Sulṭān to hold an Ayaq Dīwānı[85] which had been the practice of previous rulers in cases like this. If the Sulṭān cannot fulfil his responsibilities to his people, Qāḍī-zāde even warns him that he must account for his actions in the Hereafter.

It is clear that if the Ottoman state in this period had enjoyed rule from men of high calibre, as had been the case in the preceding centuries, these problems would have been controlled or eradicated. However, throughout almost the entire seventeenth century there was no powerful, authoritative Sulṭān except for the decade of rule by Murād IV. During this period, the Sulṭān removed, at least to some extent, this corruption and immorality by using force and terrorising people. After his death, except for the period of the vizirate of Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha and his son Fāḍil Aḥmad, the process of Ottoman decline continued.

In societies in full decline people often react in two different ways. In this respect I. al-Fārūqi makes the following observation:

---

85. Cf. p.21 above.

> "People facing a national catastrophe or in a state of decay are usually conservative. They cling to what they have inherited from their fathers, and regard their preservation of it intact as equivalent to their own survival. In Islamic history, this predilection for survival created for itself an ideological instrument with two edges. On the one hand, it is the positive value of taqlīd or doing what the fathers have done, and on the other, it is the negative value of bida' or innovation."[86]

In fact, such a development as this is inherent in Islam itself. Throughout Islamic history, those who have begun iṣlaḥ (reform) movements or have participated in them have taken their inspiration from an important religious duty, al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar, which is ordained by the Qur'ān and sunna.

When the conditions of Ottoman society on the eve of the emergence of the Qāḍī-zāde movement are considered, the necessity for such a movement seems clear. Having witnessed corruption, immorality, luxurious living and religious laxity, Qāḍī-zāde's aim was not to put forward a solution to these problems by restoring the sixteenth-century values. On the contrary his main objective was to introduce fundamental remedies which were based on the Qur'ān and sunna. As a man of religion who devoted

---

86. I. al-Fārūqi, "Science and Traditional Values in Islamic Society" in Zygon, Journal of Religion and Society, 1967, II, no. 3, p. 231.

himself emotionally to his religious beliefs and practices, he could not continue to be silent while the values and virtues of religion and morality were being violated by the members of his own society. Hence, it would be natural to assume that the main motive behind the Qāḍīzāde movement was a response to the duty of al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar.

CHAPTER II

THE OTTOMAN 'ULAMĀ'

The 'Ulamā'

Ottoman society was based on the principles of Islam and the traditional Turkish and near Eastern concepts of state. This harmonious combination of religion and tradition contributed to the emergence of one of the greatest Islamic states in the world.

Originally Islam emphasized equality among men and therefore took every precaution to prevent the creation of a class or caste system, but later, Islamic philosophers and moralists, largely under the influence of Greek philosophy, attempted to classify people according to a system of their own, trying to combine Greek and Muslim views. According to Nāṣır al-Din Ṭūsī, (d. 1274) traditional Muslim society was divided into four major social classes, each of which had its own role and function in the community. These were as follows: men of the sword, men of the pen, men of negotiation and men of husbandry.[1] Among these four classes, the first two, the men of the sword and the men of the pen, were two major groups with authority over the people. The former, the military, were charged with ruling the state and dealing with its economic affairs, while the latter, the 'ulamā', dealt with dogma and law and their applications.[2]

1. N. Ṭūsī, The Nasirean Ethics, trans. G.M. Wickins, (London, 1964), p. 230.
2. N. Itzkowitz, Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition, (New York 1972), pp. 58-9.

Most modern scholars of Ottoman society are of the opinion that it consisted of two classes, the *'askerī* (military) and *re'āyā* (subjects). The former included the Sulṭān, officers of the courts and army, civil servants and *'ılmiyye*, in short the ruling class, while the latter consisted of all the population, Muslim or non-Muslim, who played no part in the government but paid taxes.[3]

Throughout Islamic civilization, the *'ulamā'* have had a very special and distinguished position in society and commanded considerable respect from the people as well as the rulers, for they are seen as the representatives and guardians of the *sharī'a* and as teachers of religion and morality.[4]

---

3. H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age* (London, 1973), pp. 68-9, hereafter, *Empire*. Also his "Traditional Society" in Ward and Rustow (ed.), *Modernization in Japan and Turkey*, (Princeton, 1064), pp. 42-65; M. Heper, *Bureaucracy in the Ottoman-Turkish State*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Syracuse 1971, p. 72; Ş. Mardin, "Power, Civil Society and Culture in the Ottoman Empire" in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, XII (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 258-74; H.A.R. Gibb and H Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West*, (London, 1950), I,i, 48 (n.2), p. 158 (Hereafter, *Gibb-Bowen*); Shaw, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 112-13, 150.
4. L. Marsot, "The ulama of Cairo in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" in N. Keddie, (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 149, 152.

Writings on the Ottoman 'ulamā' and 'ilmiyye can be divided into two groups. Firstly there are general words which are descriptive in approach. They begin from the early days of the institution and trace its development and its eventual decline. The indispensable work in this respect is Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilātı by İ.H. Uzunçarşılı.[5] The author covers the whole history of the 'ilmiyye from its beginnings down to the twentieth century. He provides brief and descriptive general information, with references on the 'ilmiyye, its curriculum and the qānūns relating to it, and also gives short biographies of famous 'ālims produced by Ottoman society. In fact, the book can be considered as a guide and handbook in this field.

A second general work of this kind, which deals with Ottoman educational institutions, is Türkiye Maarif Tarihi by O. Ergin[6] who concerns himself not only with medreses but also with tekkes and libraries. He pays little attention to the period before the Tanẓīmāt, which he treats in a negative manner, and mainly concentrates on the modern period.

The other works which deal with the 'ulamā' and 'ilmiyye

---

5. İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilātı, (Ankara, 1965).

6. O. Ergin, Türkiye Maarif Tarihi (İstanbul, 1939-45), 5 vols.

in general are straightforward histories of the Ottomans. In this category is H. İnalcık's, The Ottoman Empire, in which the author gives a brief history of the development of the Ottoman learned institution and scholarship.[7] S. Shaw too, in his Ottoman history, gives a brief account of the 'ilmiyye and 'ulamā'.[8] B. Lewis, in his short study of Istanbul and Ottoman civilization, also deals with the 'ulamā' and their learning in a very general way.[9] There are several articles on the 'ilmiyye and 'ulamā' in EI^2, İA and certain periodicals, but these are very general and brief.[10] Finally one cannot ignore the work of A. Adivar, which is devoted to Ottoman learning and scholarship in general.[11]

---

7. H. İnalcık, The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600 (London, 1973), pp. 165-78).
8. S.J. Shaw, History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, I, (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 132-50.
9. B. Lewis, Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire (Norman, 1963), pp. 145-72.
10. U. Heyd, E. Kuran, "'Ilmiyye" in EI^2; T. Gökbilgin, "Ulamā" in İA ; K. Yaman, "XV ve XVI Asırda Osmanlı İlmiyesi ve İlmiye Teşkilâtı" in Gerçek (İstanbul) II (1974), pp. 1-15.
11. A. Adıvar, Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim (İstanbul, 1953)

A second group of works which deal with the *'ilmiyye* are those confined to a certain period or a particular theme. These are more detailed and informative but they are limited in number. One study of this kind concentrates on the early period of the Ottoman *'ilmiyye*; *İlk Osmanlı Medreseleri* by M. Bilge.[12] The work examines the early establishment of the *medreses*, their curricula and the early development of the institution. A second similar work is *XV ve XVI Asırlar da Osmanlı Medreseleri*, by C. Baltacı, who after giving a brief background concentrates on the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In this work the author discusses the development of the *medrese* system in this particular period. He also touches upon the causes and effects of the decline of the *'ilmiyye*.[13] A systematic study concerning the evolution of the Ottoman learned hierarchy from its beginning down to the sixteenth century is that produced recently by R.C. Repp.[14] In their well-known study of eighteenth-century Ottoman

---

12. M. Bilge, *İlk Osmanlı Medreseleri*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, İstanbul, 1974.

13. C. Baltacı, *XV ve XVI Asırlarda Osmanlı Medreseleri* (İstanbul, 1976).

14. R.C. Repp, "Some observations on the development of the Ottoman learned hierarchy"in N.Keddie (ed.), *Scholars, Sūfīs and Saints* (Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 17-32.

society, Gibb and Bowen devoted one chapter to the 'ilmiyye or what they considered as "the religious institution" one to "the 'ulamā" and another one to "education".[15] But these two authors in fact reviewed these institutions from the eighteenth-century viewpoint and used predominantly eighteenth- and nineteenth-century sources.[16] Their whole work is based on the theory of Ottoman institutions advanced by Lybyer, a scholar who, not knowing Turkish, was unable to consult the original Ottoman sources. Gibb and Bowen's work did not, in fact, add much to what was already known. Their views have been closely examined by Itzkowitz[17] and Repp.[18]

One could also mention the relevant articles on Ottoman Sulṭāns and 'ulamā' and other topics in İslam Ansiklopedisi, which is the Turkish translation of the Encyclopaedia of Islam with additional articles on

---

15. Gibb-Bowen, Islamic Society and the West (London, 1957), I, part ii, pp. 70-80; 81-113; 139-164.

16. A. Hourani in his Europe and the Middle East (London, 1980), pp. 116-20, describes the background of this study.

17. N. Itzkowitz, "Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Realities" in SI, XVI (1962), pp. 73-94.

18. R.C. Repp, "The altered nature and role of the ulama", in T. Naff and R. Owen (ed.) Studies in Eighteenth-Century Islamic History (London, 1977), pp. 277-87.

Turkish history and civilization.[19] In addition to all these, the biographical sources on Ottoman ʻulamāʼ contain valuable information relating both to the people concerned and to the ʻilmiyye institution. Ottoman chronicles provide information on the ʻulamāʼ of each reign.

Individual studies which are devoted to particular institutions are of great value to the study of the Ottoman ʻilmiyye and its members, the ʻulamāʼ. In this category are such works as the theses by Repp[20] and Kaydu[21] on the office of Shaykh al-Islam and two studies on the office of qāḍī.[22]

The least known period of the history of the Ottoman ʻulamāʼ and ʻilmiyye is the seventeenth century. Although this period is crucial, it needs much more serious study.[23]

---

19. İslam Ansiklopedisi, (İstanbul, 1940)

20. R.C. Repp, An Examination of the Origins and Development of the Office of Shaykh al-Islam, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Oxford, 1966.

21. E. Kaydu (Sarıkçıoğlu), Die Institution des Scheyh-ul Islamat im Osmanischen Staat, Nürnberg, 1971.

22. R. Gür, Osmanlılarda Kadılık, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Istanbul.; H. Sobotta, Das Amt des Kadi im Osmanischen Reich, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Munster, 1954.

23. For the eighteenth century, see A. Uğur, op. cit.

The term *'ulamā'* in Ottoman society signified those men who had not only studied and been trained in the *medreses*, but who also organized and supervised the religious institutions, the mosques, the religious endowments and the legal system.

It is clear from the existing biographers of the early Ottoman *'ulamā'* that they either came from other Muslim countries or they completed their higher education in those countries. They were appointed by the rulers as *qāḍīs*, *müftis* and *müderrises* in the newly conquered cities and towns.[24] The first attempt to educate and train the Ottoman *'ulamā'* within the borders of the Ottoman state started with the establishment of the first Ottoman *medrese* by Orkhān Ghāzī (d. 1360) in İznik in 731/1330. His successors followed the same practice by building more *medreses* in the capital cities of Bursa and Edirne.[25] It is worth noting that the appointment of the first qaḍī

---

24. Tashköprü-zāde, *Shaqāiq al-Nu'maniyye*, (trs. Majdī) (İstanbul, 1269); 'Atā'ī, *Dhayl al-Shaqāiq*, (İstanbul, 1268); I.H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, I (Ankara, 1947), p. 26; R.C. Repp, "Some observations on the development of the Ottoman learned hierarchy" in N. Keddie (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 32.

25. Uzunçarşılı, *op. cit.*, p. 268; *Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilātı* (Ankara, 1965), pp 1-3. Gibb-Bowen, I, ii, p. 83.

'asker by Murād I (d. 1389) as the leader of the *'ulamā'* gave him the authority to designate and supervise the qāḍīs and *müftīs* and other *'ulamā'* in the state. In fact his basic task was the establishment and organization of the essential educational institutions to create a body of learned men and intellectuals to satisfy the administrative needs of the state. This achievement should be considered as very important in the development of the *medrese* system and the *'ilmiyye* as a whole.[26] By the reign of Meḥmed II the process had achieved very successful results and the supervision of the *'ulamā'* became such a burden for a single man to undertake that a second qāḍī-'asker was appointed.[27]

Although the qāḍī-'asker was leader of the *'ulamā'*, it is rather difficult to talk about a hierarchy among the Ottoman *'ulamā'* until the later years of the reign of Meḥmed II. The *qānūn-nāme* promulgated by him, the earliest to have survived, deals with the *'ulamā'* and their status and the structure and organization of the *medreses* and their curriculum. This *qānūn-nāme* was the basis of the establishment of an Ottoman learned hierarchy and at the

---

26. S.J. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, (Cambridge, 1976) I, p. 138, hereafter Shaw-*Empire*; K. Yaman, "XV ve XVI Asırda Osmanlı İlmiyesi ve İlmiye Teşkilâtı" in *Gerçek*, vol. II, no. 7 (İstanbul, 1974), pp. 7-13.

27. M. M. Pixley "The development and role of the

same time it gave the leadership of the 'ulamā' to the Müftī of Istanbul who was later called the Shaykh al-Islām.[28] From the sixteenth century onwards the hierarchy became very rigid and the Shaykh al-Islām was the highest and most powerful and influential religious authority as the leader of the learned class.[29]

Regarding the Ottoman 'ulamā' and their work it is clearly understood that they held office in four different areas.

1) The judiciary (as qāḍīs, müftīs)
2) The academic profession (müderrises)
3) The religious services (khaṭībs, imāms)
4) The administration (müfettishes, inishānjis, qassāms).[30]

Seyhulislam in early Ottoman history" in Journal of the American Oriental Society, 96 (1976), p. 1; R.C. Repp, op. cit., pp. 19-20.

28. Tārīkh-i 'Othmānī Enjümeni Mejmū'ası, supplement no. 13 (İstanbul, 1330), p. 10 (Hereafter TOEM); U. Heyd, "Ilmiyye" in EI[2], III, pp. 1153-5; Gibb-Bowen, I, ii, p. 84; Uzunçarşılı, İT, p. 175.

29. J. Kramers, "Shaykh al-Islām" in EI[1], IV, pp. 275-9.

30. C. Baltacı, XV ve XVI Asırlarda Osmanlı Medreseleri, (İstanbul, 1976), pp. 56-8 (Hereafter Medreseler); Yaman, op. cit., p. 34; İnalcık, Empire, pp. 169-72; Heyd, op. cit., pp. 1152-3.

Besides these four major areas, some members of the 'ulamā' specialized in medicine or astrology. But for the purposes of this study only the first three groups will be discussed: the first two, the jurists and professors, will be referred to in this thesis as the "official" 'ulamā', and the third, the religious functionaries, as the "lesser" 'ulamā'.

a) The Shaykh al-Islām was the highest religious authority and at the same time the leader of the 'ilmiyye, particularly after the late fifteenth century. He was appointed by the Sulṭān on the recommendation of the Grand Vizier from among the leading 'ulamā' of the time. He was an adviser to the Sulṭān himself on state affairs in general and religious affairs in particular. The Sulṭān used to consult him when he needed a fatwā or a declaration of war or peace. In the seventeenth century he became very influential and was consulted by the Sulṭāns in almost all state affairs.[31]

---

31. J. Kramers, "Shaykh al-Islām" in EI[1], IX, pp. 275-9; Uzunçarşılı, İT, pp. 173-215. 'Alī Emīrī, "Meshīkhāt-i Islāmiyye Tārīkhčesi" in 'Ilmiyye Sālnāmesi (İstanbul 1334); R.C. Repp, op. cit.

Gibb-Bowen, I, ii, pp. 84-6.

b) The office of qāḍī-ʻasker was the next highest rank in the ʻulamāʼ hierarchy.[32] One of the two qāḍī-ʻaskers was assigned to Anatolia, with authority to deal with matters relating to the Asian provinces, while the other was assigned to Rūmeli with responsibility for matters concerning the European provinces.[33] Unlike the Shaykh al-Islām the qāḍī-ʻaskers were members of the Imperial Dīwān (Dīwān-ı Hümāyūn) and acted as assistants to the Grand Vizier in the administration of justice, enjoying the privilege of nominating the lesser qāḍīs and müderrisses in their provinces. They were also in charge of the administration of military law.[34]

c) In Ottoman society, as in other Islamic societies, the müderrises were responsible for the education of young scholars, particularly those who would carry through the Islamic cultural heritage and traditions from one generation to another. The medreses in which this education

---

32. K. Nagy "Ḳāḍī-ʻasker" in EI², V, p. 376; Gibb-Bowen, op. cit., pp. 86-7; Lybyer, op. cit., p. 220; Repp, op. cit., p. 18.
33. Uzunçarşılı, Merkez Teşkilātı (Ankara, 1945), pp. 228-9; Shaw, op. cit., pp. 138-9.
34. A. Mumcu, Divan-ı Humāyun (Ankara, 1976), pp. 46-7; Gibb-Bowen, op. cit., p. 87.

was given were ranked in several grades, with corresponding salaries, and an ambitious _müderris_ would seek to work his way up the ladder.[35] It may be added here that a _müderris_ might combine his official teaching duties with certain other paid employment, such as imām to the sehzāde or Grand Vizier.[36]

d) In the Ottoman state, the administration of law and the application of the _sharī'a_ were carried out by two groups of _'ulamā'_, _qāḍīs_ and _müftīs_.[37] _Qāḍīs_ were judges, who were selected from among those who had completed their _medrese_ education and received _mülāzemet_.[38] They decided juridical cases which were brought to their courts, and

---

35. Uzunçarşılı, _IT_, pp. 55-63, 271; Baltacı, _Medreseler_, pp. 26-31; İnalcık, _Empire_, pp. 166-71; Gibb-Bowen, _op. cit._, pp. 146-7; Repp, _op. cit._, pp. 25-6.
36. A. Uğur, _op. cit._, pp. L-LXII.
37. B. Lewis, _Istanbul_, pp. 147; İnalcık, _Empire_, pp. 169-71; Gibb-Bowen, _op. cit._, pp. 122-3, 133, 135; Shaw, _Empire_, pp. 137-8.
38. See below, pp.66-7

judged in accordance with the *sharī'a* and *qānūns*.[39]

e) The second group of the legal *'ulamā'* were the *müftīs* who had the authority to issue *fatwās* in accordance with the *sharī'a* and *qānūns* in response to cases which were proposed to them by individuals or executive officials such as the *subashi*.[40]

f) Some of the Ottoman *'ulamā'* performed religious functions in the mosques acting as *imām*, *khaṭīb*, *wā'iẓ* *müedhdhin* or *qayyum*.[41]

The *imām*: His main function was to conduct the daily prayers in the mosque. He was appointed to office with a daily allowance either by the qāḍī of the province or sometimes by the founder or trustee (*mütewellī*) of the endowment (*waqf*) which supported the mosque. Imāms were appointed either from among *'ulamā'* who had studied in a

---

39. K. Nagy, "Ḳāḍī" in *EI*², V, p. 375; O. Ergin, *Mejelle-i Umur-i Belediyye* (İstanbul, 1929), I, pp. 257-305. Heyd, *op. cit.*, pp. 215-19. J. Schacht, *Introduction to Islamic Law* (Oxford, 1964) pp. 89-90.

40. J.R. Walsh "Fatwā" in *EI*², III, pp. 866-7; U. Heyd, "Some aspects of the Ottoman fetwas" in *BSOAS*, 38 (1969); Shaw, *Empire*, pp. 137-8; Uzunçarşılı, *İT*, p. 174.

41. Gibb-Bowen, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-8; Baltacı, *Medreseler*, p. 57; C. Baysun, "Mescid" in *İA*, IV.

Dār al-qurrā'[42] or even sometimes from among medrese students.[43]

The khaṭīb was responsible for conducting the weekly Friday service during which he delivered the sermon (khuṭba), which was a summary of and commentary on the significant events of the week. He also mentioned the name of the ruler at that time, in his khuṭba.[44]

The wa'īz,[45] or shaykh, as he was called, was responsible

---

42. Dār al-qurrā': A kind of medrese where the students memorized the Qur'ān and learnt the technique involved in, and various ways of, reciting it. Graduates of this institution used to hold positions in the mosques as imāms, müedhdhīns and other functionaries.
43. Baltacı, op. cit., pp. 22-34; J. Pedersen, "Masdjid" in EI[1], III, p. 372; Gibb-Bowen, op. cit., pp. 95-6.
44. Gibb-Bowen, op. cit., p. 96; Baltacı, op. cit., p. 57; Pedersen, op. cit., p. 372.
45. J. Pedersen, "The Islamic Preacher" in S. Löwingern and J. Somogyi (eds.) Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume (Budapest, 1948), I, pp. 220-51; Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 96; Baltaci, op. cit., p. 57; Al-Jawzi, Kitāb al-Quṣṣāṣ wa'l-Mudhakkirīn (ed. and trs. M. Swartz) (Beirut, 1971); chapters, I, III, V; Pedersen, "The Criticism of the Islamic Preacher" in Die Welt des Islams, II (1953), pp. 215-31.

for preaching before or after the prayer depending on the time of day and the day of the week. He played a significant role in informing the public of their religious duties and showing them the right way to live according to the principles of Islam. He was chosen from among the *'ulamā'* who possessed affiliations with a Ṣūfī Order or had Ṣūfī tendencies.[46]

As for the *Müedhdhin*, his responsibility was to call the *edhān* from the minaret to announce to the faithful the time of prayer. He was chosen from among the individuals who had a religious education and a fine voice and training in the *Dār al-qurrā'*.[47]

The *qayyum* was in charge of the external cleanliness of the mosque, supervised the work of the mosque servants and, in addition, took care of the mosque property.[48]

In Ottoman society, the *imām* and the *müedhdhin*, in addition to their religious functions described above, performed a number of social duties as well. They were in charge of maintaining the social and moral order and counselling the people on various problems of a social and

---

46. Baltacı, *op. cit.*, p. 37; Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 96.
47. Baltacı, *op. cit.*, p. 24; Pedersen, "Masdjid" in *EI*[1], III, p. 373.
48. Baltacı, *op. cit.*, p. 57; Gibb-Bowen, ii, pp. 96-7

religious nature.[49]

Besides the 'ulamā' mentioned above, there were some other high-ranking offices in the 'ilmiyye hierarchy: the Sulṭān's tutor, (mu'allim or khwāja), his two private imāms, the head physician (Ḥekīmbashı) and the head astrologer (Münejjimbashı) were also regarded as high-ranking 'ulamā'.[50]

In the seventeenth century the office of Naqīb al-Ashrāf, who dealt with the descendants of the Prophet, was given greatly increased importance. The Naqīb was chosen from among the highest-ranking 'ulamā', i.e. those who had held the office of qāḍī of İstanbul, or qāḍī 'asker. Although the office of Naqīb al-Ashrāf had been created by Bāyezīd I in 1400 within the 'ilmiyye, it was not made a preserve of the higher 'ulamā' until the seventeenth century.[51]

There was a special group of 'ulamā' who were called Müfettishes and looked after waqf affairs. They were under the supervision of the Shaykh al-Islām, the Grand Vizier and the Chief Black Eunuch.[52]

---

49. O. Ergin, op. cit., p. 139.
A. Refik, On Altıncı Asırda Istanbul Hayatı (İstanbul, 1935), p. 88.

50. U. Heyd, "'Ilmiyye" in EI², III, p. 1152; Lybyer, op. cit., pp. 207-18; İT, pp. 145-9.

51. İT, pp. 161-72; Gibb-Bowen, ii, pp. 92-4; Heyd, op. and loc. cit.

52. İT, p. 208; Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 92; Heyd, op. cit., pp. 1152-3; Lybyer, pp. 207-14.

The Education of the 'Ulamā'

According to the two fundamental sources of Islam, the Qur'ān and sunna, 'ilm, knowledge, has great significance in Islam and Islamic society.[53] The 'ālim, who possesses 'ilm, is highly praised in the Qur'ān and in the traditions of the Prophet as a man who is the spiritual guide of his society. In fact, the 'ulamā' in every Islamic community, in the past and at present, are[54] the purveyors of Islam, the guardians of its traditions, the depository of ancestral wisdom, and the moral tutors of the population.[55]

Although it is outside the scope of this study to treat the subject of the education of the 'ulamā' in Ottoman society in detail, the aspects relevant to this thesis will be discussed briefly.

A boy who had received preparatory instruction either in a public school or privately had the right of admission to a medrese of the lowest grade. Naturally the medreses of Istanbul were the first choice of many families.

---

53. On the issue more detail can be found in the study of 'Ali Uğur, "The Ottoman 'Ulemā in the Mid. 17th Century..." pp. XXXVII-LXVI.
54. A discussion on the concept of 'ilm in Islām, and its importance, can be found in F. Rosenthal, Knowledge Triumphant (Leiden, 1970), pp. 19-70.
55. A.L. Marsot, "The 'Ulama of Cairo in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" in N. Keddie (ed.), op. cit. pp. 149-67.

As has been said above, the first Ottoman medrese was established by Orkhān Ghāzī in 1331 in Iznik. In the course of time, numerous medreses were established in Bursa, Edirne and Istanbul and other cities and towns of the state by successive Sulṭāns and statesmen.[56] The significant developments in the medrese system took place after the establishment by Meḥmed II of the Ṣaḥn-ı Thamān medreses. He was probably also the first Sulṭān to lay down in qānūns the rules concerning their organisation and curriculum.[57]

According to the Ottoman educational system of the seventeenth century, every student who gained admission to the medrese system had to start from the lowest grade (called Tajrīd) and could proceed from there by stages right up to the highest grade. In the Ottoman medrese curriculum of the time, students studied various subjects of traditional Islamic education. The various grades of medrese can be divided into five groups:

i) The Tajrīd, Miftāḥ, Qırqlı and Khārič medreses provided students with a general background in Arabic, rhetoric, logic, theology, ḥadīth and other related subjects. The

---

56. For more detailed information see M. Bilge, İlk Osmanlı Medreseleri, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, İstanbul University, 1974, pp. 15-17; Uzunçarşılı, İT, pp. 3-17; Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 144.

57. Repp, op. cit., p. 19; Baltacı, op. cit., pp. 46-50.

textbooks used for these studies were traditional works on these subjects.[58]

ii) Dākhil medreses: These medreses taught at an intermediate level subjects already begun in medreses of a lower grade, and two new subjects, tafsīr and fiqh, were added.

iii) Ṣaḥn-ı Thamān: In these medreses students were provided with advanced courses in tafsīr, ḥadīth and fiqh.

iv) Altmıshlı Medreses: These medreses offered the most advanced courses, although particular emphasis was laid on law and theology, the study of ḥadīth, tafsīr and rhetoric was also included.[59]

v) In the Süleymāniyye medreses alone students studied additional subjects such as mathematics, geometry, medicine and related topics.[60]

Every student who began a medrese education was required to obtain a certificate of proficiency in each grade before he was allowed to proceed to the next grade. The students in the lower grades of medrese were called

---

58. Baltacı, op. cit., pp. 36-43; Uzunçarşılı, İT, pp. 11-17.
59. İT, pp. 19-31; Shaw, Empire, p. 133; İnalcık, Empire, pp. 168-9; Baltacı, op. cit., pp. 35-43.
60. Shaw, op. cit., p. 133.

sūkhte or softā[61] while those who reached the ṣaḥn had the status of danishmend, i.e. learned and on graduating from there became candidates for vacant position in the ʻilmiyye.[62] A student having finished his studies at the ṣaḥn or Süleymāniye with the status of danishmend was eligible to apply for a career in the ʻilmiyye. In order to achieve this, he had first to register himself with the appropriate qāḍī-ʻasker, i.e. for Anatolia, the qāḍī-ʻasker of Anatolia and for Rūmeli, the qāḍī-ʻasker of Rūmeli and secondly he had to associate himself with a high-ranking and influential ʻālim through whom he could obtain his mülāzemet (status of candidacy for a müderris or qāḍī post). The period between graduation from the medrese system and obtaining the mülāzemet is described as newbet. The length of the newbet would depend on the number of graduates and, in the seventeenth century, on the level of bribe the graduate was able to offer.[63]

---

61. Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 146.

62. Gibb-Bowen, ibid.; Baltacı, op. cit., pp. 31-34; İT, pp. 7-8.

63. İT, pp. 45-53; A. Uğur, XL-XLIV; Baltacı, Medreseler, pp. 31-5; Repp, op. cit., p. 25.

Decline of the Ottoman 'Ilmiyye

As noted above, the 'ilmiyye as one of the fundamental organisations of the state had a very important role to play. This importance was largely due to the fact that members of the 'ilmiyye held posts in the government and other institutions and they also trained officials for several kinds of government offices.

The decline of the 'ilmiyye can be traced back to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and may be discerned in two important areas; firstly in the changing attitude of the 'ulamā' towards the rational sciences which were taught in the medreses and secondly in the corruption which occurred in the institution itself as a whole.

The whole subject of the decline of the Ottoman 'ilmiyye, its causes, its implications and its effects upon the other institutions of the Ottoman state has not yet received its due attention. In spite of its obvious importance to Ottoman history, the authors who have dealt with the 'ulamā' or 'ilmiyye in their works in one way or another have touched only lightly upon this issue. No detailed study has so far appeared on this important question.

Interest in the decline of the 'ilmiyye can be traced back to the sixteenth-century chronicles. Among the historians of this period, we find that 'Ālī (1541-99) in his Kunh al-Akhbār describes the shortcomings and faults

of the *'ilmiyye* and its members.[64] Later, the historian Selānikī (d. 1600) also touches upon the same question and criticizes the *'ulamā'* as a body which has allowed itself to decline. His approach is similar to that of 'Ālī.[65] Both of them discuss the breakdown of the institution of the *'ilmiyye*, pervaded as it was by corruption, but they do not look in depth into the underlying inability of the *'ulamā'* to deal with the pressing religious and social problems of their time.

In the seventeenth century, the authors of *risālas* or *lāyiḥas* generally devoted one or two chapters to the position and status of the *'ulamā'*. Qoči Beg,[66] in his famous *Risāla*, discusses the problem from several angles and presents the position of the *'ulamā'* at that time in a detailed and realistic way. Later the author of *Kitābu Mesālihi'l-Müslīmīn wa menāfi'il Mü'minīn* devoted two sections of his book to the *'ulamā'* and the problems which they had to face.[67] One factor common to all these authors is that they deal with the institutional decline, the external problems which

---

64. 'Ālī is quoted in the works of Baltacı and Uzunçarşılı; see *İT*, pp. 69-71; Baltacı, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-67.
65. See M. İpşirli, "Mustafa Selānikī and his history" in *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, IX (İstanbul, 1978), pp. 460-63.
66. Qoči Beg, *Koçi Bey Risalesi*, Z. Danişman (ed.) (Istanbul, 1972), pp. 24-32, 126, 127.
67. *Kitābu Mesālihi'l-Müslīmīn wa menāfi'il-Müminīn*, Y. Yücel (ed.), Ankara, 1980, chapters I and VIII.

the *'ulamā'* faced and the change in their social status, but do not make any analysis of the intellectual aspect of this decline. They omit to discuss how far the *'ulamā'* were affected by the changes which were taking place in the *'ilmiyye* and they do not mention the reaction of the *'ulamā'* themselves towards these fundamental changes. It would appear that Kātib Čelebi, (d. 1656) in his book *Mīzān al-Haqq*[68] is the only Ottoman scholar who deals with the intellectual decline of the *'ulamā'*. But even he does not produce a full discussion on this issue.

The modern scholars who have dealt with this issue have naturally made use of these sources in their works. In this connection the first work to mention is *Ilmiye Teşkilâtı*, in several parts of which the author, in an unsystematic manner, points out the decline of the *'ilmiyye* and its effects.[69] Following him, C. Baltacı, in a more systematic approach, discusses the causes and implications, but he pays very little attention to intellectual decline.[70]

H. İnalcık, in his *Ottoman Empire*, includes a chapter entitled "The triumph of fanaticism", where he describes

---

68. Kātib Čelebi, *Mizānü'l-Hakk*, O.Ş. Gökyay (ed.) İstanbul, 1972, pp. 7-13.
69. Uzunçarşılı, IT, pp. 67-75, 179-187.
70. Baltacı, *Medreseler*, pp. 60-71.

the change in the attitude of the Ottoman 'ulamā' towards knowledge and sciences. He then cites some incidents as examples of the emergence of fanaticism in the Ottoman 'ilmiyye. In this connection he touches upon Birgiwī, Qāḍī-zāde and his followers and their activities. Although his approach is from the intellectual viewpoint, the fact that he does not give any source for his information lessens the value of his contribution. He also makes the mistake of presenting Qāḍī-zāde as a student of Birgiwī, who died at least ten years before Qāḍī-zāde was born.[71]

Among western authors there are some who have concerned themselves with this problem in their writings. Gibb and Bowen mention the hierarchical changes as well as the social decline of the 'ulamā' and the implications of this. Repp, in his recent article "The altered nature and role of the ulama", discusses the views of Gibb and Bowen concerning the Ottoman 'ulamā' and also deals with changes which took place in the goals and aims of the 'ulamā' in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The analysis given below is an attempt to show in more detail the causes and effects of the institutional and intellectual decline of the Ottoman 'ulamā' in the early part of the seventeenth century, which forms the background against which the Qāḍī-zāde movement arose. This movement was to share the suspicion and hostility of

---

71. İnalcık, Empire, pp. 179-85.

some groups of 'ulamā' towards the rational sciences. On the other hand, the Qāḍī-zādelis stressed the need to reform the 'ilmiyye and wanted a return to a system based on the principles of the Qur'ān and sunna.[72]

By the late sixteenth century there was an obvious change in the attitude of the 'ulamā' towards learning. They had turned against such subjects as mathematics, geometry and medicine.[73] This meant a complete change in the curriculum of the medreses by the late sixteenth century. It is generally accepted that in the heyday of the Ottoman state the Sulṭāns and the members of the 'ilmiyye, under the influence of al-Ghazālī, held a tolerant and flexible attitude towards the rational sciences.[74] As a result, although the medrese curriculum consisted mainly of religious sciences, as mentioned already, they included some of the rational sciences in the medrese syllabus. However, it was not uncommon by the late sixteenth century to find a group of 'ulamā' who objected to rational sciences and considered the study of them to be impious.[75] Probably the influence of such a

---

72. Kātib Čelebi mentions that Qāḍī-zāde himself did not consider people who study logic as Muslim, an attitude which was shown by Ibn Taymiyya and his followers.

73. K. Čelebi, Mīzān, pp. 6-13; A. Adıvar, Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim, pp. 110-111; Rycaut, op. cit., p. 37.

74. İnalcık, Empire, p. 179.

75. Ibid. İnalcık presumably bases his remarks on the work of K. Čelebi, but he does not cite his sources.

group of scholars was limited and did not affect the whole system of education and way of thinking in the medrese until the seventeenth century. At that period, according to Kātib Čelebi, the rational sciences were nearly removed altogether from the medrese curriculum.[76] An event which took place in the reign of Sulṭān Murād III (1574-95) may be cited here. In 987/1579 a highly advanced observatory in Istanbul was demolished, on the basis of a fatwā issued by the Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad Shams al-Dīn (d. 1580), who considered it to be "ill-omened".[77]

The omission of the rational sciences from the medrese curriculum in the seventeenth century would tend to suggest that the hostility among the 'ulamā' towards them had gained momentum. Moreover, works on theology, such as Khāshiye-i Tejrīd and Sharḥ-ı Mawāqif, which were classical Ottoman texts in the medreses, were excluded from the teaching programme on the basis that they were philosophical works.[78] Thereafter two works of fiqh, Hidāye and Akmal, replaced them. The selection of these two works led the Ottoman 'ulamā' to concentrate more on law. This process, according to Kātib Čelebi, marked the end of intellectual development and the beginning of stagnation in the Ottoman 'ilmiyye.[79]

---

76. Mīzān, p. 9.

77. Adıvar, op. cit., pp. 90-1; İnalcık, op. cit., pp. 179-80.

78. Kātib Čelebi, Mīzān, p. 8.

79. Ibid., p. 9; Adıvar, op. cit., p. 110.

In this connection Rycaut makes the following observation, which is significant for describing the status of the rational sciences in Ottoman society in the mid-seventeenth century.

> "For other Sciences, as Logick, Physick, Metaphysick Mathematicks, and other our University Learning, they are wholly ignorant; unless in the latter, as far as Musick is a part of Mathematicks, whereof there is a school apart in the Seraglio. Only some that live in Constantinople have learned some certain rules of Astrology, which they exercise upon all occasions and busie themselves in Prophesies of future contingences of the Affairs of the Empire, and the unconstant estate of great Ministers, in which their predictions seldom divine grateful or pleasing stories. Neither have the wisest and most active Ministers or Souldiers amongst them, the least inspection into Geography, whereby to be acquainted with the situation of countreys or disposition of the Globe, though they themselves enjoy the possession of so large a portion of the Universe."[80]

The appearance of Qāḍī-zāde (d. 1635) with his negative attitude towards the rational sciences, naturally encouraged the growing bigotry and fanaticism among the Ottoman 'ulamā'.[81] This lack of intellectual curiosity

---

80. Rycaut, op. cit., p. 32.

81. H. Atay, "Memleketimizde İlim ve Din Anlayışı Üzerine" in İFD, XVII (1969), pp. 83-115; Mīzān, p. 9.

and this hostility towards scholastic endeavours, shown by the seventeenth-century Ottoman 'ulamā', occurred at a time when great strides were being made in the sciences in Europe.[82]

Turning now to the corruption within the 'ilmiyye institution as a whole, this manifested itself in a number of significant ways. Already in the late sixteenth century there were rumblings of discontent among medrese students (sukhte) in remote parts of the empire, who rebelled and ran riot in their localities. Such rebellions took place mostly in cities with several medreses in western Anatolia and in Rūmeli between the years 1558-1618.[83] At the same time, there was a fall in standards amongst the müderrises, which was perhaps the most important reason for the decline of the 'ilmiyye, since students took their teachers as models for their own conduct. The teachers did not attend their classes but received salaries.[84]

There was also favouritism shown to sons of the holders of high learned offices. In this way, from the late sixteenth century onward, a new class of untrained 'ulamā' came into existence and usurped the place of the

---

82. Adıvar, op. cit., pp. 106-7; Baltacı, op. cit., pp. 61-71.

83. M. Akdağ, "Türkiye tarihinde içtimāī buhranlar serisinden : Medreseleri isyanları" in İİFM, XI (1950) pp. 361-87; Cezar, Levendler, pp. 196-210.

84. Baltacı, op. cit., p. 60; İT, pp. 67-71.

legitimate 'ulamā' who had followed the legal path of advancement.[85]

As is well-known, the late sixteenth century in the Ottoman state was a period of great internal unrest.[86] At this time, many young people sought refuge and security in the medreses where education, food and clothing were supplied free.[87] This caused a sizeable increase in the number of medrese students, but facilities remained the same and as a result the programme of study had to be compressed into a shorter time, and students promoted more rapidly from one class to another. Such developments inevitably created pressure on the students and seriously affected the standards of the education provided.[88]

This decline was further enhanced by the abuse of the system of mülāzemet. The original aim of the system was to control the candidates for office in terms of both number and quality. But elements of corruption began to appear in this period mülāzemet began openly to be bought and sold. This development was due partly to the increased length of newbet (the period which lasted from graduation to the obtaining of the mülāzemet), resulting

---

85. Baltacı, op. cit., p. 68; Uzunçarşılı, İT, pp. 67-75.
86. See above, chapter I.
87. Baltacı, op. cit., p. 64; Y. Yücel (ed.), Kitāb-ı Müstetāb (Ankara, 1974), p. VIII.
88. Baltacı, op. cit., pp. 62-64.

from the overcrowding of the profession.[89]

Although the Ottoman state and some of its institution revived somewhat during the reign of Sulṭān Murād IV (1623-40) it would appear that the *'ilmiyye* did not fully recover from the process of deterioration outlined above. Thus a vital Ottoman institution lost its influence and validity and the seeds of corruption found a fertile ground in which to grow and develop.[90]

Naturally, a corrupt educational system is bound to breed generations of corrupt graduates, who in turn corrupt their own society. Finally the Ottoman state and its society was left in the hands of the graduates of such institutions. Of course there were always exceptions. But although, in the centuries which followed, the *'ilmiyye* was subjected to some reform in its structure and curriculum, it was destined never to recover the position and influence it had formerly enjoyed in the heyday of the Ottoman state.

---

89. Uğur, *op. cit.*, XLIV; *İT*, p. 45; Repp, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

90. Repp, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-2.

The General Role and Functions of the Ottoman ʿUlamāʾ

In the structure of the Ottoman government the ʿulamāʾ were recognized as an important part. According to the Ottoman conception of state the Grand Vizier was the head of the government and the representative of the Sulṭān's authority, while the Shaykh al-Islām, who represented the sharīʿa, led the ʿilmiyye. However, above these, the Sulṭān with his absolute power and authority was in fact the supreme head of the government and the ʿilmiyye.

As is well-known, however, Islam does not ideally accept a division of affairs between the temporal and the religious. From early on, the rulers of Muslim states were compelled by the force of political and social circumstances to behave as though such a division did exist, and for this reason Islam came to be viewed as an essentially ideal theoretical system. This separation naturally also led to a division of responsibility between statesmen and men of religion, the former dealing with administrative, military and economic matters, while the latter saw to the application of the sharīʿa in the administration of the law, education and religion.[92]

---

91. İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, Saray Teşkilâtı, (Ankara, 1945), pp. 50-3; A. Mumcu, Divānı Humayun, pp. 39-41; Lybyer, op. cit., pp. 147, 158; Gibb-Bowen, i, pp. 26-36; Shaw, Empire, pp. 164-5.

92. Gibb-Bowen, ii, pp. 78-80.

The functions of the Ottoman *'ulamā'* can be gathered under five main headings.

1) The maintenance of Islamic orthodoxy, its protection against all kinds of heresies by the writing of books and treatises and the issuing of *fatwās*, the organization of missionary work for the spreading of Islam, and the preservation of the continuity of the faith by eliminating the danger of disruption in times of political change.

2) The application of the *sharī'a* in the administration of law.

3) The dissemination of Islamic religious culture, maintaining its unity from one generation to another.

4) The performance of religious duties and the supervision of *waqfs*.

5) Educating and training new scholars to respond to administrative and public demand and establishing new educational and religious institutions.[93]

Naturally that the *'ulamā'* were able to maintain all these functions it was through the co-operation of the state. They were considered by the state as a means of control and balance.

---

93. Gibb-Bowen, ii, 81-3, 170-71. U. Heyd.. "Ilmiyye" in *EI*[2], IV, p. 1152.

94. Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 110.

The 'Ulamā' and the Rulers.

During the early years of the foundation of the Ottoman state, the rulers and the 'ulamā' worked in harmony and close co-operation with each other to create what they probably believed to be the ideally perfect Islamic society. The 'ulamā' being the guardians of the sharī'a served their rulers in an advisory capacity and held important posts in the government and administration, as viziers, müftīs and müderrises.[95] This close link between the 'ulamā' and the rulers was necessary because in this way the 'ulamā' were able to keep the ruler strictly within the bounds of Islamic traditions. Of course, the rulers were well aware of the power and influence of the 'ulamā' over the Muslim population, and by giving them the opportunity of taking an active part in the administration they gained public confidence and support. The influence of the 'ulamā' over the rulers during this period is described by Wittek as follows:

> "The 'ulemā, now too numerous and too powerful, not only succeeded in winning over the sultan to the more subtle habits, pleasures, and arts of High Islam, but also to their views on the organization of the state. This they now endeavoured to fashion according to Old

---

95. İ. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Tarihi, (Ankara, 1947), I, pp. 37-8; B. Lewis, Istanbul, pp. 54-5.

Moslem traditions, much too fast and without regard to the existing conditions. Above all, the ʻulemā converted the sultan to their ideas of external policy, which naturally concerned the countries of High Islam, which were their spiritual home."[96]

In general, the Ottoman Sulṭāns treated members of the ʻulamāʼ with respect and sought their advice. They consulted them in state affairs and religious matters. Guided by the religious education they had received, and being aware of the great power of the ʻulamāʼ, they treated them with reverence and as far as possible avoided any confrontation with them.[97]

Although relations between the state and the members of ʻilmiyye were thus generally amicable and harmonious, there were cases when the ʻulamāʼ refused to accept official posts, as is noted by Repp:

"This relative cooperation between the ulema and the secular authorities was not achieved without some difficulty, without overcoming certain deep-seated prejudices. Taşköprüzāde's grandfather (d. 879/1474-75), for example, refused to take up an appointment at the newly built Sahn for fear of becoming caught up in distracting ambitions for personal glory. He also warned his son, Taşköprüzāde's

---

96. P. Wittek, The Rise of the Ottoman Empire (London, 1958), pp. 47-8.

97. Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 80; Lybyer, op. cit., pp. 225, 229, 233.

father, never to become a kadi, as a result of which the latter refused an appointment as kadi of Aleppo."[98]

Cooperation between the 'ulamā' and the state achieved the following: the suppression of conspicuous manifestations of heresy, the harmonisation of the qānūn nāmes with the sharī'a; the establishment and maintenance of medreses for the training of the 'ulamā'; and the fostering of social unity and obedience to the rulers.[99]

This relationship between the state and the 'ulamā' was used by the state as a means of controlling the masses and gaining their confidence in the event of confrontation, if the 'ālim concerned failed to convince the Sulṭān, his fate was either dismissal or exile.[100]

It was presumably for this reason that the Ottoman

---

98. Repp, "Some observations" in N. Keddie, op. cit., p. 30.

99. Gibb-Bowen, ii, pp. 77, 80-81, 83; İnalcık, Empire, p. 193.

100. Repp, An examination of the origins and development of the office.... p. 313.
For example, the dismissal of Shaykh al-Islam Ciwī-zāde by Süleymān the Magnificent because of his hostile attitude towards some Sūfī leaders, i.e. Jalāl al-Dīn Rumī, Muhyi 'l-Dīn 'Arabī; also Meḥmed IV's exiling of Shaykh 'Othmān of Atpazarı, because of his criticism in the Sulṭān's presence, of corruption in the state. See below pp. 102

'ulamā' rarely issued fatwās contrary to the Sulṭān's will, and hardly ever dared to oppose the Sulṭān's decision. In fact, the 'ulamā', the representatives of religion, were subject to the will of the ruler, who, as the absolute authority had the right to appoint and dismiss them.[101]

On the other hand, the Ottoman 'ulamā' enjoyed a number of privileges granted to them by the state. Some classes of them received a salary from the treasury, and scholars might be rewarded for the books and treatises they composed. All of the 'ulamā' were exempted from taxation and their goods and properties could not be confiscated. In principle they were also exempt from capital punishment.[102] The 'ulamā' also received income from waqfs which they controlled.[103] When members of the higher 'ulamā', such as the Shaykh al-Islām, the qāḍī-'asker or the holders of the most senior qāḍīship were retired or dismissed they were given an arpalik, i.e. the income (ḥāṣılāt-ı sher'iyye) of one or two qāḍās.[104]

---

101. N. Berkes, "Iṣlāḥ" in EI², III, p. 168; Lybyer, op. cit., p. 229.

102. As notable examples of the breach of this principle, the execution of three Shaykh al-Islāms may be cited: Hüseyn Ef. (d. 1634), Mes'ūd Ef. (d. 1656) and Feyḍullāh Ef. (d. 1703). See İT, pp. 222-6.

103. B. Lewis, Istanbul, p. 150.

104. İT, pp. 118-21; Gibb-Bowen, ii, pp. 108-9, 124, 126; Heyd "'Ilmiyye", EI².

In the seventeenth century, despite the decline in the moral behaviour, and therefore, the social status of the <u>'ulamā'</u>, there were signs that, as a body led by the <u>Shaykh al-Islām</u> they now wielded greater political power. As opposed to the situation in the previous centuries, the <u>'ilmiyye</u> in the person of the <u>Shaykh al-Islām</u> now received strong political recognition by the rulers. The <u>Shaykh al-Islām</u> was always consulted by the Sulṭāns on all matters, religious or not.[105] Two main factors appear to have played an important role in this development. Firstly, the rulers of this century were mainly, as pointed out in chapter I, inexperienced and very young. They did not have enough training or education for governing a state, as their predecessors had done. Secondly, in the more difficult conditions of government in the seventeenth century, these Sulṭāns needed <u>fatwās</u> from the <u>Shaykh al-Islām</u> to enforce their policies and authority. In particular, they needed support in <u>fatwās</u> when they wished to depose or kill their relatives. In this context Rycaut makes the following valuable observations

> "The Mufti is the principal head of the Mahometan Religion or Oracle of all doubtful questions in the Law, and is a person of great esteem and reverence amongst the Turks; his

105. Uzunçarşılı, <u>İT</u>, pp. 188-9

election is soly in the Grand Signior, who chuses a man to that office always famous for his learning in the Law, and eminent for his virtues and strictness of life; his Authority is so great amongst them, that when he passes judgement or determination in any point, the Grand Signior himself will in no wise contradict or oppose it.......

In matters of state the Sultan demands his opinion, whether it be in condemination of any great man to death, or making War or Peace, or other important affairs of the Empire; either to appear the more just and religious, or to incline the people more willingly to obedience. And this practice is used in businesses of greatest moment; scarce a Vizier is proscribed, or a Pashaw for pretence of crime displaced, or any matter of great alteration or change designed; but the Grand Signior arms himself with the Mufti's sentence; for the nature of man reposes more security in innocence and actions of justice, than in the absolute and uncontrouleable power of the sword. And the Grand Signior, though he himself is above the Law, and is the Oracle and Fountain of Justice, yet it is seldom that he proceeds so irregularly to contemn that Authority wherein their Religion hath placed an ultimate power of decision in all their controversies."[106]

As a mark of their prestige and influence, the holders of the Shaykh al-Islām used to accompany the Sulṭān during

---

106. Rycaut, op. cit., pp. 105-6.

their campaigns.[107] This was not generally the case in the preceding centuries. Moreover, the *'ulamā'* as a body showed their political strength at certain key moments in the seventeenth century. For instance, when the *'ulamā'* realized Sulṭān Muṣṭafā's unfitness to rule, they informed the Sulṭān's mother of their opinion so that she might take the necessary action to depose him with their support.[108]

This great power wielded by the *'ilmiyye*, and in particular by the *Shaykh al-Islām*, carried with it certain risks. With the accession of the only successful Sulṭān of this period, Sulṭān Murād IV, the balance of power changed dramatically. Sulṭān Murād was responsible for the first execution of an Ottoman *Shaykh al-Islām*, who had some connection with the rebellion of the Janissaries in 1041 (1632).[109]

His rigorous prohibition of coffee drinking and use of tobacco was carried out in disregard of the more tolerant attitude of the *Shaykh al-Islām* on these matters.[110]

---

107. Uzunçarşılı, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

108. M. Aktepe, "Mustafa" in *İA*, VIII, pp. 693-4; M. Sertoglu, "Tuği Tarihi" in *Belleten*, II (1947), p. 513.

109. Uzunçarşılı, *İT*, pp. 223-4; idem, *OT*, pp. 185, 198.

110. See the discussion of the tobacco issue in chapter VII below.

Under the weaker Sulṭāns who succeeded Murād IV the <u>'ulamā'</u> were able to re-establish their political power. An example of this can be seen in the alliance between the military leaders (<u>ojaq aghaları</u>) and the <u>'ulamā'</u> in Rajab 1058 (August 1648) which resulted in the deposition of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, the dismissal and death of the Grand Vizier Aḥmad Pasha, and the accession of Sulṭān Meḥmed IV.[111]

---

111. Uzunçarşılı, <u>OT</u>, III, p. 241; Akdağ, in <u>Tarih Araştırmaları</u>, p. 224.

The Relations of the 'Ulamā' with the Public

Like all other Muslim communities, the Muslim majority of the Ottoman public always regarded the 'ulamā' as their teachers, spiritual guides and leaders, and moreover considered them as its spokesmen.[112] As representatives of the sharī'a the 'ulamā' possessed legitimate authority, and through their control over religion and educational institutions and waqfs, which were a vast source of revenue, they wielded considerable power. This double representative function provided the 'ulamā' with a strong moral and political power over the masses. Since before the seventeenth century, the 'ulamā' were not involved in political intrigue and lacked their own organs of enforcement, the task of ensuring conformity of both state and public to the rules of religion was the only way in which they exercised their authority.[113] Like the 'ulamā' in other Muslim societies, the 'ulamā' acted as a kind of bridge, a means of arbitration and communication between the ruler and the ruled.[114]

---

112. Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 110; K. Yaman, "Osmanlı İlmiyesi.." in Gerçek, pp. 32-5.

113. Lybyer, op. cit., pp. 225, 229, 232.

114. Gibb-Bowen, op. cit., p. 110; A.L. Marsot, "The Ulama of Cairo in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" in N. Keddie, op. cit., p. 153.
Usually the 'ulamā' acted on the side of the government rather than on the side of society. This was common

Obviously the imams, preachers and mü'edhdhīns were those members of the 'ulamā' who had the closest day to day relations with the common people. These members of the 'ilmiyye did not confine their activities merely to the mosques, but these were also concerned with the social problems of the community.[115]

The wa'īẓ (preacher) in particular, was very influential over the masses through his sermons, and at times succeeded in leading them to revolt, as in the case of Üstüwānī Meḥmed Ef. (d. 1661) who led the people against the Ṣūfīs.[116] On the other hand, the müftīs and the müderrises had limited contact with the masses because of the nature of their work.

---

feature of the Muslim 'ulamā' in every part of the Muslim world. N. Berkes, "Iṣlāḥ" in EI², III, p. 168; Marsot, op. and loc cit.

115. Gibb-Bowen, op. cit., p. 80.

116. See below, chapter V.

CHAPTER III

OTTOMAN ṢŪFĪSM

The Ṣūfīs

The Ṣūfī orders played a consistently important role in the Ottoman state. Their establishment preceded the founding of the house of ʿOthmān, and they were influential throughout the formative period of Ottoman rule and the centuries in which Ottoman supremacy was undisputed. The Ṣūfī orders or ṭarīqās exerted a significant influence on the social, political and cultural life of the Ottoman state. In fact, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that they were more active and effective than the official ʿulamāʾ, who could not reach the people. The Ṣūfīs not only became the spiritual leaders of the masses, but sometimes they also assumed political leadership over them.

Although it is not within the scope of this study to give a full history of the Ṣūfī orders in the Ottoman state, it is necessary at least to provide a brief survey and some general information in regard to the Ṣūfī orders and their development, in the context of the expansion of the Ottoman state, and finally, to investigate their position and role in the seventeenth century.

Although Ṣūfism as a way of life and a religious ideal traces its roots back to the early centuries of Islam,[1] its sudden and rapid expansion and spread begins in the thirteenth century. This century witnessed the end of

---

1. S. Trimingham, Orders, pp. 1-10; A.J.Arberry, Sufism (London, 1950), chapter II.

the Abbasid Caliphate and also the division of Anatolia into more than a dozen small states or beyliks, each trying to maintain and extend its territory following the Mongol invasion.[2] This period also saw the dissemination of Ṣūfism throughout Iran, Anatolia and Egypt.[3] Although there was no central authority, and economic and social life was in ruins, this period marked a pronounced development of the religious life, as is pointed out by Schimmel:

> "This period of the most terrible political disaster was, at the same time, a period of the highest religious and mystical activity. It seems as though the complete darkness on the worldly plane was counteracted by a hitherto unknown brightness on the spiritual plane."[4]

It seems that three important factors played an undeniable role in the sudden popularity of the mystic way of life in the Muslim world. Firstly, the Mongol invasion and the presence of the Crusaders had created a sense of insecurity which encouraged recourse to the

---

2. J.C. Birge, The Bektashi Order of Dervishes, (London, 1937), pp. 24-26.

3. M.F. Köprülü, Türk Edebiyatinda İlk Mutasavviflar, 2nd edition, (Ankara, 1966), p. 167; C. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, (trs. J. Williams), (London, 1968), pp. 255-60.

4. A.M.Schimmel, The Triumphal Sun, A Study of the Works of Jalālod din Rumi (London, 1980), p. 9.

religious life, and many people became involved with the Ṣūfī orders in order to obtain happiness if not in this world, at least in the hereafter.[5]

A second factor was an increase in the *ghāzī* spirit, which urged the Ṣūfīs towards the Islamisation of Anatolia.[6] The activities of the *ghāzīs*, as a matter of fact, played an important part in the spread of Ṣūfism and the propagation of Islam.

A third factor was the encouraging attitude of the Turkish rulers of Anatolia towards the Ṣūfīs. Both the Seljuqs of Rūm and the rulers of the small *beyliks* which emerged after their downfall took an active part in establishing tekkes and endowing *waqfs*.[7] Accordingly, some of the cities in Anatolia became centres of Ṣūfism,

---

5. Birge, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
6. Birge, *op.* and *loc. cit*; V.L. Ménage, "The Islamisation of Anatolia" in N. Levitzon (ed.) *Conversion to Islam*, (New York, 1979), p. 59; For a detailed study of the spread of Islam in Anatolia, see S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh Through the Fifteen Century*, (Berkeley, 1971), ch. V; also by the same author "Nomadization and Islamization in Asia Minor" in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 29 (1975), pp. 41-73.
7. O. Turan, *Selçuklular Tarihi ve Türk İslām Medeniyeti* (Ankara, 1965), p. 225.

as, for example, Konya, Kayseri, Ankara and Sivas. After the establishment of such centres, Anatolia attracted many Ṣūfīs from other Islamic lands, such as Iran, Iraq, Syria, Khurāsān and Transoxiana. Thus by the first half of the thirteenth century Anatolia became home to such Ṣūfī masters as Jalāl al-Din Rūmī (d. 1273), Muḥyi 'l-Dīn 'Arabī (d. 1240), Ṣadr al-Dīn Konawī (d. 1274) who settled in Konya, Fakhr al-Dīn 'Irāqī (d. 1289) who moved to Tokat, Hajji Bektāsh Walī who came to Kirsehir and Naẓm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 1221) who settled in Sivas.[8] Consequently, before the establishment of the Ottoman state, there were several Ṣūfī orders in Anatolia, such as Bābā'iyya,[9] Mawlawīyya,[10] Qalandariyya,[11] and Kubrawiyya.[12]

---

8. For more detail see A. Gölpınarlı, Mevlanā Celāleddin, Hayatı, Felsefesi, Eserleri, Eserler inden seçmeler, (Istanbul, 1959), pp. 1-19, 20-21; Köprülü, op. cit. pp. 168-85; H. Inalcik, Empire, pp. 199-200; Schimmel, op. cit., p. 30.
9. The founder of this order was Bābā Ishāq, who was a preacher. It was a militant Shī'a movement. See C. Cahen, "Bābāi" in EI², I, pp. 843-4.
10. Mawlawīyyā: founded by Mawlānā Jalal al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273) in Konya, whence it spread to Syria and Egypt. See A. Gölpınarlı, "Mevlevilik" in İA, VIII, pp. 164-71.
11. Qalandariyya: its founder is not known but the movement was like the Bābā'īs; see T. Yazıcı, "Kalandariyya" in EI², IV, pp. 473-4.
12. Kubrawiyya: founded by Najm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 1221). One of the most widespread ṭarīqas in the Muslim world; see Trimingham, op. cit., pp. 55-7.

With regard to their organisation and rituals, the Ṣūfī orders may be divided into two major groups.[13] The first consisted of the established orders which had their own *waqfs* and *tekkes*, as well as their own distinct ways of worship, rituals and special dress. These *tarīqas* were usually supported by the rulers and pious rich; among them may be included the Mawlawīs, the Naqshibandīs,[14] the Bayrāmīs[15] and the Bektashīs. The second group was made up of the dervish orders which had no organized establishment or common way of dressing, and whose rituals were secret and esoteric. Unlike the former, they had no relations with the state, and from time to time opposed the government and established authorities. As a matter of fact, they always maintained a militant Shī'a feeling and exploited at every opportunity any weakness in the central government.[16] Among those were the Ḥaydarīs,[17] Qalandarīs[18] and Melāmīs.[19]

---

13. İnalcık, *op. cit.*, p. 190.
14. Naqshibandiyya, founded by Bahā' al-Dīn al-Naqshibandi (d. 1389); see Trimingham, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-5.
15. Bayrāmiyya, founded by Hajji Bayrām Walī of Ankara (d. 1459); see Gölpınarlı, *Mevlānā Hayatı ve Eserleri*, pp. 33-9.
16. İnalcık, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
17. Köprülü, *op. cit.*, p. 289.
18. Yazıcı, *op. cit.*, pp. 473-4.
19. A. Gölpınarlı, *Melāmilik ve Melāmiler* (İstanbul, 1931).

During the process of establishment of the Ottoman state, the Ṣūfīs made a significant contribution. The Islamisation of the conquered territories was achieved by the constant missionary activities of the Ṣūfīs.[20]

During the foundation of the Ottoman state there was also another important organisation, similar to the Ṣūfīs in its orientation, which is worth mentioning. This was the akhī[21] institution which included the leaders of the young men who associated themselves as guilds in Anatolia. Their contribution to the young Ottoman state was significant. They helped the Ottomans by joining in campaigns and they provided a link between the ruler and the ruled.[22] However, as the Ottoman state expanded and advanced the akhī institution declined and during the fifteenth century it ceased to exist.[23]

---

20. B.A. Cvetkova, Les Institutions Ottomanes en Europe, (Wiesbaden, 1978), pp. 22, 24, 25; N. Çagatay, Bir Türk Kurumu olan Ahilik, (Ankara, 1974); Ö.L. Barkan, "Bir İmār ve İskān Metodu olarak Temlikler, I, İstilà Devrinin Kolanizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zaviyeler" in Vakıflar Dergisi, (Ankara, 1942), II, pp. 279-386; P.F. Sugar, Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804, (Seattle, 1977), pp. 15-35.
21. Fr. Taeschner, "Akhī" in EI^2, I, pp. 321-23; F. Sugar, loc. cit; Trimingham, op. cit., pp. 24-5.
22. Köprülü, op. cit., pp. 81, 83, 85; Taeschner, op. cit., p. 322.
23. Taeschner, op. and loc. cit.

The Ṣūfī orders began to establish themselves within the boundaries of this flourishing new state. The respect which was accorded to the Ṣūfī leaders by the Ottoman ruler and state officials encouraged and attracted many Ṣūfī masters to come and settle down in Ottoman territory, even from ṭarīqas which had established themselves outside Anatolia, in countries like Irān, 'Irāq and Transoxiana. Among these orders were the Qādiriyya,[24] Rifā'iyya,[25] Khalwatiyya[26] and Naqshibandiyya.[27] The Qādiriyya and the Rifā'iyya were introduced into Ottoman society following the conquest of 'Irāq in the sixteenth century. The Naqshibandiyya originated in Central Asia and is said to have been introduced into Anatolia in the late sixteenth century.[28] The Khalwatiyya originated in the Caucasus and was introduced into Anatolia from the late fourteenth century.[29]

---

24. Margoliouth, "Ḳādiriyya" in EI², IV, pp. 80-3; Trimingham, op. cit., pp. 40-44.
25. Margoliouth, "Rifā'ī" in EI¹, III, pp. 1156-7; Trimingham, op. cit., pp. 37-40.
26. F. De Jong, "Khalwatiyya" in EI², IV, pp. 991-3; also B.G. Martin, "A short history of the Khalwati order of dervishes" in N. Keddie (ed.), op. cit., pp. 275-305.
27. T. Yazıcı, "Nakşibend" in İA, IX, pp. 53-4; Trimingham, op. cit., pp. 62-4.
28. B. Lewis, Istanbul, pp. 157-8.
29. Martin, op. cit., p. 276.

Early in the following century (1416) there was a revolt by the Ṣūfī shaykh Badr al-Dīn, a militant Messianic leader who wanted to establish his own political dominion. The militant Shī'a orientation of this movement made the government very keen to suppress it quickly and thoroughly; the shaykh himself and his khalīfa Börklüce Muṣṭafā were executed.[30] This was the motive behind the severe steps taken in 1444 against the Ḥurūfiyya[31] order, which had even spread into Ottoman official circles.[32]

The conquest of Istanbul in 1453 by Meḥmed the Conqueror, who had a tolerant and flexible attitude towards the Ṣūfī leaders and their followers, turned the city into a major centre of Ṣūfism in the Muslim world. Accordingly, the new capital became crowded with Ṣūfī tekkes and waqfs where every ṭarīqa practised its ceremonies and rituals.[33]

The following century was the period during which the

---

30. Kissling, "Badr al-Dīn" in EI², I, p. 869.
31. A. Bausani, "Ḥurūfiyya" in EI², III, pp. 600-1.
32. F. Babinger, Meḥmed the Conqueror and his Time, trans. from German by R. Manheim), (Princeton, 1978), pp. 34-6.
33. K. Kufralı, "Molla İlâhi ve kendisinden sonraki Nakşibendîye Muhiti" in İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi, III (1949), pp. 129-51.

Ottoman state, society and civilization reached its zenith. During this period, the Ṣūfī movement developed in two directions. Firstly, the period witnessed the continued expansion of the ṭarīqas with numerous branches emanating from the principal orders. These subsidiary orders spread throughout the Ottoman dominions, not only in the Balkans and Anatolia, but also in the Arab lands.[34] Secondly, it was in this period that there emerged an attitude on the part of certain prominent members of the 'ulamā', such as Birgiwī, Čiwi-zāde and Ḥalabī, which was hostile to the Ṣūfīs and their practices and beliefs.[35] This was in contrast to the tolerant and flexible treatment of the Ṣūfīs by the rulers and some of the state officials. In general, the sixteenth century was a period in which the state encouraged and supported a moderate form of Ṣūfism, along the lines set by al-Ghazālī in the Seljuq state.[36] On the other hand, the Ottoman authorities showed no tolerance whatever towards those individual Ṣūfī leaders who went beyond the limits of the accepted forms of Ṣūfism. Such leaders were quickly labelled heretics and suppressed.[37]

---

34. Gibb-Bowen, pp. 196-8; Köprülü, "Mısırda Bektaşilik" in Türkiyāt Mecmuası, VI (1939), pp. 14-22; T. Tawil, al-Taṣawwuf fi Miṣr Ibbān al-'Aṣr al-'Uthmānī (Cairo, 1946).

35. Cf. below, discussion on samā' and raqṣ.

36. İnalcık, op. cit., pp. 175, 6.

37. N. Berkes, "Iṣlāḥ" in EI², IV, p. 167.

There are a number of episodes which highlight state policy in the sixteenth century in regard to the Ṣūfīs. The first was the execution of three Ṣūfī leaders by the fatwās of various Shaykh al-Islāms. The first Ṣūfī leader to be so executed was Shaykh Ismā'ıl Ma'shūqī, generally known as Oghlan Shaykh, who was born in 914/1508-9 in Aksaray, where his father Pīr 'Alī was a leader of the Bayrāmī order. After his early education, he arrived in Istanbul in 934 (1527) and was appointed a preacher. He then preached in the capital and in Edirne, where he propagated the doctrine of waḥdat al-wujūd and acquired many followers, most of whom were soldiers.[38] By the time he became well-known, rumours abounded about his way of performing dhikr and some of his ideas. It was said that he employed careless and sarcastic language when he talked about the sharī'a. Moreover, he claimed that all the obligations of religion could be dropped for those who reached a certain stage of attainment in the Ṣūfī way. Besides this, he was also accused of pronouncing the dhikr "Allāhım, Allāhım" with the final syllable unstressed, to suggest the meaning "I am God," instead of "Allāhim, Allāhim" with the final syllable stressed, meaning "My God." The

---

38. R. Repp, op. cit. p. 292

A. Gölpınarlı, op. cit., pp. 48-51.

authorities, who considered his teachings as capable of corrupting the beliefs of the people, asked him to cease his activities and go back to his place of birth. But the shaykh replied "Our end is known to us" and did not change his ways. With his twelve followers, he was therefore executed in 935/1529 in Atmeydānı, on the basis of a fatwā of the Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Kemāl.[39]

The second Ṣūfī shaykh who was executed was Shaykh Karamanī about whom information is very scant. What is known about him is that he was accused of being a heretic and an unbeliever. He was therefore executed after a fatwā of Abu 'l-Su'ūd, Shaykh al-Islām of the time, on 3 Sha'bān 957/17 August 1550 in Istanbul.[40]

Another prominent Ṣūfī to be killed by the fatwā of Abū 'l-Su'ūd was Shaykh Hamza Balī of Bosna (saray bosna) who acted as preacher in his town. The scholars and intellectuals of this town complained about him to the Qāḍī of Bosna. It was said that some of his actions were contradictory to the sharī'a. He was, moreover, according to his accusers, illiterate and therefore unable to preach and teach. When the qāḍī sent a report concerning Hamza Balī's position the shaykh was called to Istanbul where the case was investigated carefully by the Shaykh al-Islām

---

39. H. Yurdaydın, İslam Tarihi Dersleri, (Ankara, 1971), p. 109 Gölpınarlı, op. cit., pp. 48-54.

40. Yurdaydın, op. cit., p. 110.

Abu 'l-Su'ūd. Basing his fatwā on his predecessor Ibn Kemāl, Abu 'l-Su'ūd declared that Hamza Bālī should be executed (961/1561).[41]

On the other hand, the policy of the government towards the Ṣūfīs in general could be favourable and sympathetic. This was shown in the dismissal of the Shaykh al-Islam Čiwī-zāde from his position because of his apparent opposition to Muḥyi 'l-Dīn 'Arabī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī by the ruler of the time, Sulṭān Süleymān the Magnificent who was an admirer of the Ṣūfīs in general and Muḥyi 'l-Dīn 'Arabī and Jalāl al-Dīn in particular.[42]

The end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century witnessed the development of a close relationship between the rulers and the Ṣūfī masters in general and the Khalwatiyya shaykhs in particular. In order to make use of the influence of the Ṣūfī shaykhs in time of war, and at the same time to win the hearts of the followers of those Ṣūfī leaders, the rulers invited them to accompany the troops on campaigns. Although this had been the unofficial practice among the previous Ottoman rulers, this particular period is significant because the invitation to the Khalwatī shaykhs to accompany campaigns

---

41. Yurdaydın, op. cit., p. 110; Gölpınarlı, op. cit., pp. 72-77; Repp, op. cit., p. 294.

42. Repp, op. cit., pp. 314-5; V.L. Ménage, "Čiwi-zāde" in EI^2, II, pp. 56-7; Yurdaydın, op. cit. III

was issued by a ferman of the Sulṭān himself.[43]

Although the late sixteenth century manifested signs of decline in administration and in society, there was, in contrast, visible progress and development in Ottoman Ṣūfism. This development in Ṣūfism can be attributed to two important elements which in several ways contributed to this progress. The first factor sprang from the existence of social, economic and political discontent and suffering. The growth of social evils, such as bribery, corruption, nepotism and favouritism within the established ruling institutions, was responsible for the emergence of a tendency for the people to seek out alternative social frameworks within which to acquire education and express themselves spiritually and intellectually. The existence of insecurity created by the economic crises and social disturbances of this period encouraged spiritual values which brought people to the door of the tekke. A second factor which favoured Ṣūfism may be considered to be the official prohibition of the use of tobacco and coffee, both of which stimulants had been eagerly accepted by the

---

43. For more detail, see ch. IV below. A.Keskin, A critical edition of Enīsī's "Menāḳib-i Aḳ Şems ed-Dīn" with an account of Aḳ Şems ed-Dīn's political and religious influence as revealed in this work, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Manchester, 1977, pp. 227-8. The actual text of the fermān is in ʻUshaqī-zāde, p. 45 and Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, part I, p. 357.

Ṣūfīs.[44] This attitude, combined with the government's ban, attracted many new members into the Sūfī orders and there was a rapid increase in their numbers, particularly amongst the Khalwatiyya. This group was noted for offering shelter to coffee and tobacco addicts.[45]

On the other hand, these flourishing Ṣūfī activities marked a new development and brought them under attack from a new group of people who were to form the major opposition to the Ṣūfīs and were militant enough to make a clash with the Ṣūfīs inevitable. This opposing group consisted of a number of preachers, under the leadership of Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed (d. 1635), who considered the practices and some beliefs of the Ṣūfīs to be uncanonical, innovatory and heretical. Qāḍī-zāde launched an intensive campaign in order to abuse the Ṣūfīs. This hostility had been exacerbated by the increasing popularity and influence of the Khalwatiyya order, particularly in the Ottoman government and among state officials, which excited jealousy amongst Qāḍī-zāde and his followers. As is

---

44. See below, discussion on tobacco and coffee.

45. B.G. Martin, "A Short History of the Khalwatī Order of Dervishes", in N. Keddie (ed.) Scholars, Saints and Sufis (Berkeley, 1972), p. 288; H.J. Kissling, "The sociological and educational role of the dervish orders in the Ottoman Empire" in Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association, no. 76 (1954), p. 26.

pointed out by Kissling:

> "It cannot be an accident that important key positions of that period were occupied by relatives of Ḫalvatiyya sheikhs or at least by Ḫalvatiyya sympathizers. For example the clan of the Jemālizāde, the branches of which I have traced carefully, not only provided men in leading government positions but also Ḫalvatiyya sheikhs."[46]

Together with their increased popularity the ṭarīqas began to acquire more influence at the Ottoman court. It was during this period that Sulṭān Meḥmed III invited Shams al-Dīn Siwāsī (d. 1605), a celebrated leader of the Khalwatiyya and founder of its Shamsiyya branch[47] to accompany him on his campaign against Austria in 1596. This shaykh must have wielded a great deal of influence, for a fermān was issued in 1005/1599 in which a certain ʻAbd al-Majīd Siwāsī, who was later to become the leader of the Ṣūfīs, was invited to Istanbul, to the Čarsanba Tekke.[48] Sulṭān Aḥmad I (1603-17) was to maintain this special relationship by offering ʻAbd al-Majīd Siwāsī the post of preacher in his own mosque, the Sulṭān Aḥmad.[49]

---

46. Kissling, op. cit., p. 31.
47. S. Wijdānī, Tomar-ı Ṭuruqu ʻAliyyeden Khalwatiyya, (İstanbul, 1338), pp. 134-6.
48. Cf. below ch. IV, Siwasī's life story.
49. Cf. ch. IV below.

This Sulṭān also developed a deep friendship with one of the great and eminent Ottoman Ṣūfīs, 'Azīz Maḥmud Hüdâyī (d. 1033/1628), the founder of the Jalwatiyya branch of the Bayramīyya order of dervishes.[50]

With the accession of Murād IV in 1623, however, there was a change in this policy. On the one hand, the new Sulṭān cultivated Ṣūfī influence by offering patronage to certain Ṣūfīs, in particular 'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī. At the same time, though, he bestowed favours on the leader of the opposition, Qāḍī-zāde, for political purposes.[51] According to Thāqib Dede (d. 1148/1735) Murād was hostile to the Ṣūfīs, particularly the Mawlawīs whom he treated very harshly. For example, he removed Abu Bakr Čelebī (d. 1638) from Konya to Istanbul, when he was on his way to the Rewān campaign.[52] It is possible to detect Qāḍī-zāde's influence upon the Sulṭān in this action. Furthermore, Sulṭān Murād IV executed some Ṣūfī leaders in Anatolia, for political reasons, as he considered that their followers presented a threat to his authority. In 1049 Shaykh Aḥmad, a Ṣūfī leader known as "the Shaykh of Sakarya", allegedly

---

50. F. Tansel, "Seyyīd 'Azīz Maḥmud Hudâyi" in <u>İFD</u>, XV (1967), pp. 1-42.

51. Cf. ch. IV below.

52. Thāqib Dede, <u>Sefīne-i Mawlawiyya</u>, (İstanbul, 1283), pp. 166-9; also Gölpınarlı, <u>Mevlevilik</u> p. 164.

declared himself Mahdī and even fought against government troops and defeated them. He was later captured and, despite his denial of the charges, was executed.[53] Shaykh Maḥmūd of Rumya, a Ṣūfī leader who had a large following, shared the same fate as Shaykh Aḥmad. The numbers of his followers gave the impression that he might rebel against the authorities at a suitable moment. So Sulṭān Murād did not hesitate to order the execution of the shaykh.[54]

The reign of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm (1640-48) witnessed more changes in the policy of the Palace against the Ṣūfīs which will be discussed in detail later.[55] During this period the followers of Qāḍī-zāde had powerful and influential representatives among the Palace aghas, other Palace servants and state officials. The Qāḍī-zādelis were stronger than the Ṣūfīs in this period and while the supremacy of the Ṣūfīs' opponents demonstrated itself freely, the Ṣūfīs rapidly collapsed. Since real political power at this period was in the hands of the Wālide Sulṭāns, Palace aghas and other officials, it was natural that the prestige and influence of the Qāḍī-zādelis should increase as a result of their infiltration of the Palace.

This situation was to continue during the reign of

53. Fadhlaka, II, p. 195.

54. Uzunçarşılı, OT, vol. III, part 2, p. 210.

55. See below, ch. V.

Meḥmed IV (1648-1687), who, as pointed out by Baysun, had come under the influence of the Qāḍī-zādelis from his early days.[56] Moreover, his tutor,[57] Wānī Meḥmed, was to become the third leader of the Qāḍī-zādelis. In this case it is clear that the Ṣūfīs had very little chance. Nevertheless, the accession of the new Sulṭān was the first time that the Mawlawīs were given the privilege of performing the coveted ceremony of girding the sword at the accession of the Sulṭān, and were thus elevated to a position which brought them to the same level as the Bektāshī order of dervishes.[58]

The Mawlawīs, however, were not destined to enjoy this treatment for long. Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha was appointed as Grand Vizier in 1656. After the clash in the Fātiḥ Mosque in 1656, as a result of which the leaders of the Qāḍī-zādelis were exiled to Cyprus in the same year, Köprülü also did not hesitate to use force in order to suppress the Mawlawī, Khalwatī, Jalwatī and Shamsī dervishes.[59]

---

56. Baysun, op. cit.

57. The office of tutor to the Sulṭān (Pādishāh was held by an eminent member of the 'ulamā' whose function was to instruct the Sulṭān in the principles of religion.

Uzunçarşılı, İT, p. 145. Gibb-Bowen, ii, p. 90.

58. Kissling, op. cit., p. 31.

59. Ubicini Letters, I, p. 103.

The arrival of Wānī Meḥmed some time after 1662 and his promotion to the position of tutor of the Sulṭān was a victory for the cause of the Qāḍī-zādelis at the Ottoman court. As will be seen later, his time was to be disastrous for the Ṣūfīs. He succeeded in prohibiting the sama‘[60] and also forbade the visitation of the graves of certain saints. There was, however, some resistance and opposition from the Ṣūfīs, particularly from the Khalwatīs. Here it seems appropriate to refer to Shaykh ‘Othman (d. 1103/1691)[61] of Atpazarı and Niyāzī al-Miṣrī (1617-1694). The former was a preacher who had acquired a great reputation. When in 1096 he was invited to deliver a sermon at the court in the presence of the Sulṭān, he outspokenly mentioned the social realities, problems and anxieties of the people. He was therefore exiled to his place of birth, where he died in 1690.[62] The latter was a Khalwatī with a strong commitment to the Shī‘a. When in 1673 he also made political remarks in his sermons he was banished to Rhodes, a fate which was to befall him on several occasions.[63]

The seventeenth century in general witnessed an intolerant and hostile attitude towards the Ṣūfīs, but

---

60. Thāqib Dede, op. cit., p. 184.

61. ‘Ushāqī-zāde, pp. 686-7.

62. Ibid.

63. Gölpınarlı, "Niyāzī-i Miṣrī" in Şarkiyat Mecmuası, VII (1972), pp. 183-226.

this harsh treatment, instead of discouraging Ṣūfism, had the opposite effect. Indeed, it produced a very successful, flourishing period for Ṣūfism in comparison with preceding centuries. This development demonstrated itself in two areas; firstly, the increase in the number of Ṣūfī orders and the establishment of new tarīqas, and secondly, in producing eminent Ṣūfīs and scholars who contributed a great deal in their works to the propagation of the Ṣūfī way of life and to the defence of its opponents. According to information given in Rycaut[64] and in the Ottoman sources there was a rapid increase in the establishment of new branches of the ṭarīqas in general and the Khalwatiyya in particular. The Khalwatīs with their subsidiary branches were the most rapidly developing order. For example, new branches of the Khalwatiyya during this century included the Shamsiyya,[65] Siwāsıyya[66] and Miṣriyya.[67] In addition to these branches, there was

---

64. Rycaut, op. cit., pp. 136-50. Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, part I, pp. 358-62.
65. The Shamsiyya was established by Shams al-Dīn Siwasī (d. 1006/1597). See Wijdānī, op. cit.,pp. 134-6.
66. Its founder was ʿAbd al-Aḥād Nūrī (d. 1061/1650). See ibid, pp. 136-7.
67. Its founder was Niyāzī al-Miṣrī. See ibid; also V. Gordlevskij, "Le tariqat de Mysri Niyazi" in Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de l' URRS (1929), pp. 153-60.

the formation by Sinān Ümmī (d. 1075/1664) of a new *ṭarīqa* which was called Sināniyya.[68]

A second factor which contributed to the vitality of Ṣūfism in this period was the appearance of well-educated and devotionally committed Ṣūfī masters. Perhaps they emerged thus in reaction to these hard times when they had to suffer at the hands of their religious opponents as well as some state officials. Ṣūfīs during this period demonstrated their intellectual ability and proved their superiority over their opponents by producing scholarly works and convincing, well-documented arguments. Some of the eminent Ṣūfī masters of this century were: ʻAbd al-Majīd Siwāsī (d. 1635), ʻAzīz Maḥmūd Hüdāyī (d. 1628), Ismāʻīl Rusūkhī (d. 1041/1631), ʻAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī (d. 1650), Ismāʻīl Rūmī (d. 1041/1631),[69] Hüseyn Lāmekānī (d. 1035/ 1625),[70] Ṣunʻūllāh Ghaybī (d. 1072/1662),[71] Sarı ʻAbd Allāh (1071/1660),[72] ʻOthman Ef. Shaykh of Atpazarı (d.1691)[73]

---

68. *OM*, I, p. 85.

69. *OM*, I, p. 25.

70. Gölpınarlı, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

71. *Ibid.*, pp. 119-122; *OM*, I, pp. 136-7; Köprülü, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

72. Gölpınarlı, *ibid.*, p. 138; *OM*, I, p. 100.

73. ʻUshaqī-zāde, pp. 686-7.

and Niyāzī al-Miṣrī (d. 1694).[74] Their works vary from tafsīr and ḥadīth to certain particular topics which were discussed during this period. For example, the Ṣūfī masters who came directly under the attacks of the Qāḍī-zādelis, or were adversely affected by these anti-Ṣūfī trends, usually turned their efforts and studies towards defending the practices and beliefs of the Ṣūfīs. In this category were such people as 'Abd al-Majīd, 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī and Ismā'īl Rusūkhī. Others concentrated their attention on the composition of commentaries on the works of the early Ṣūfīs, for example, the Mathnawī of Jalāl al-Dīn Rumī or on the production of detailed interpretations of some chapters of the Qur'ān or collections of various traditions. Of course, they also wrote books and risālas on Ṣūfism itself, its way of life and its importance, as well as qasīdas, na'at and other forms of poem in which they expressed their love of God and His Prophet.

---

74. Gölpınarlı, op. cit., p. 185.

The Role of the Ṣūfīs

Following the account of the historical development of Ṣūfism in the Ottoman state, an attempt will be made here to evaluate the wide-ranging functions of the Ṣūfī orders in order to find out their contribution to Ottoman education, culture and society.

While the medrese with its curriculum represented the established and official educational institution of the Ottoman state, not surprisingly it could not satisfy all the educational requirements of the society. The official curriculum of the medrese included the study of classical Arabic and a survey of the accepted Islamic sciences such as tafsīr, ḥadīth, fīqh and kalām. The "official" 'ulamā' acquired expertise in two main subjects, law and theology, and later on they performed duties in two main areas, law and education.[75]

However, the medrese syllabus was supplemented by teaching in other educational institutions outside the medrese itself, namely in the tekke, where instruction was offered by the Ṣūfī brethren. While the majority of Ṣūfī lay adherents were uneducated, generally the Ṣūfī leaders had enjoyed a good education. Moreover, a significant proportion of them were either members of the 'ilmiyye or graduates of the Enderūn (the Palace

---

75. Cf. chapter II, above.

School),[76] besides those who had received their education within the confines of the tekke. We are constantly reminded that members of the ʻilmiyye were often accomplished poets, a skill which required a knowledge of poetry in general and of Persian poetry in particular. Such skills were not acquired in the medrese, and we must therefore presume that the influence of the tekke as an educational institution was pervasive throughout the educated élite.[77]

Within the tekkes a follower could expect to study the Qur'ān, ḥadīth, Arabic and Persian, as well as receiving instruction in Persian and mystic literature.[78]

---

76. V.J. Parry, "Enderūn" in EI², II, pp. 697-8; B. Miller, "The curriculum of the Palace School of the Turkish Sultans" in The Macdonald Presentation Volume, (Princeton, 1933), pp. 303-24.

77. M. Kara, Tekkeler, pp. 179-89. (This is the only work which gives a history, however brief, of the tekke's contribution to Ottoman culture); M. Kocatürk, Tekke Şiiri Antolojisi (Ankara, 1955), introduction; Gibb, HOP, I, pp. 58-71; Trimingham, Orders, p. 238.

78. Information on the courses which were taught in the tekkes can be found in the biographies of individual Ṣūfīs, e.g. ʻAbd al-Majīd Siwasī and ʻAbd al-Aḥad. There is, however, no work on the subject.

The Ṣūfīs were prepared to make the classical syllabus of the *medrese* more accessible by simplifying the language and popularizing the content of the sources. The *medrese* syllabus was beyond the reach of the common man and the *ṭarīqas* took up the task of disseminating some areas of knowledge through the medium of a language that would be understood by a wider public.[79] The richness of Ṣūfī literature is well-known. Such literature contains mystical approaches to the Islamic sciences of *tafsīr* and *ḥadīth* and encompasses commentaries on the great Ṣūfī works and many translations of classical works into Turkish.[80]

The contribution of the *tekkes* to Islamic culture is undeniable and is recognized by the majority of Muslims. Some orders opened their doors to a certain class of society only, whilst other welcomed all. Similarly, some *ṭarīqas* tended to promote particular cultural activities, as in the case of the Mawlawīs, who excelled in music.[81]

---

79. Köprülü, *op. cit.*, pp. 289-306; Birge, *op. cit.*, pp. 73, 219.

80. Works of great Ṣūfīs such as al-Sulamī (941-1021), Abd al-Qadīr Gaylanī (d. 1166), Junayd (d. 910) and commentaries on *Mathnawi*, *Nafahāt al-Uns* by Jāmī and *Reshahāt ʻayn al-Ḥayāt* of al-Kāshifī Hüseyn b. ʻAlī al-Waʻīẓ (d. 1497-8).

81. Schimmel, *op. cit.*, p. 371; Gölpınarlı, *Mevlevilik*, pp. 443-525.

It is not an exaggeration to claim that it was in the *tekke* that poetry, music and calligraphy most flourished. The Mawlawīs made the major contribution in this field through their encouragement of the teaching of the Persian language and mystic poetry.[82] Besides their religious, intellectual and artistic activities, the *tekkes* cultivated certain physical recreations, namely bowmanship and wrestling, which were recognized as national sports.[83]

The Ṣūfīs also played a social role within the Ottoman state. Although Ottoman Islamic society was manifestly based on religious principles which controlled almost every sphere of life, within this social order there was a further infrastructure of religious influence which was comprised by the *ṭarīqas*. The orders acted as local points around which various elements of Muslim society would gather under the spiritual guidance of a Ṣūfī. These groups were able to derive strength from the intensity of the spiritual feelings of their members. Often they provided the only forum in which various classes of society could mix, so that people from

---

82. Trimingham, *op. cit.*, p. 238; Gölpınarlı, *op.* and and *loc. cit*; Kocatürk, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5. S. Nüzhet, *Türk Musikisi Antolojisi* (İstanbul, 1943) pp. 7-115.

83. M. Kara, *Tekkeler*, p. 195; O. Ergin, *op. cit.*, pp. 196-8.

backgrounds as diverse as the *Enderūn*, the *'ilmiyye* and the *esnāf* (artisans and craftsmen) could come together not only for worship but also for social intercourse. In particular, crafts and industries benefited from this social intermixing. However, it must be noted that, with time, certain orders became associated with certain classes in society, so that the Mawlawīs came to be associated with the cultural élite and the Bektāshīs with the common soldiery. However, in theory, if not in fact, the orders were open to all.[84]

The *tekkes*, and the *waqfs* associated with them, played an important role in the welfare of society, from the point of view of both its spiritual and its physical needs. Like the medieval monastery, the *tekke* played host to the traveller, nursed the sick, clothed the poor and fed the hungry. In short, it offered a comprehensive set of social services, which were not provided by the government.[85]

The heads of the orders were usually respected as community leaders in their areas. They were more popular than officials, who invariably stood for the government. The Ṣūfī shaykhs of the established orders (the first of my two groups) represented the views of their followers to the governing powers, and could be confident that they

---

84. Kara, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-51; Trimingham, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-82, 233.

85. Trimingham, *op. cit.*, pp. 226, 232.

would be respected by the government by virtue of the great influence which they could bring to bear on their disciples. Theirs was the role of the intermediary who sought a just solution which would ultimately benefit the people and appease the government. When it was necessary they voiced the grievances of the people and condemned corruption and injustice.[86] This valuable link between the government and the people was appreciated by the Ottoman administration, since such a link offered no threat to established authority. The role of these Ṣūfī orders in the establishment of law and order as well as in the maintenance of social stability is undeniable.[87]

The dervish orders also provided a system of communication and mutual hospitality throughout the different regions of the vast Ottoman lands. A Ṣūfī could be sure of finding within these brotherhoods a network of associates which spanned the empire in a way that was not parallelled by the secular administration.[88]

In contrast to the positive contribution of the established orders to the maintenance of harmonious relations between rulers and ruled, the militant orders (my second group) were often associated with underground movements, protests or even rebellions at times when the

---

86. E.g. Shaykh ʻOthmān of Atpazarı; see ʻUshāqī-zāde, pp. 686-7; Trimingham, Order, p. 234.
87. Trimingham, op. cit., pp. 235-8.
88. Idem, p. 235.

central authority was weak or faced economic or social crises. The history of these rebellions in Anatolia stretches back to before the foundation of the Ottoman state, to the revolt led by Babā Isḥāq[89] in 1239. Among the most significant anti-authoritarian movements within the Ottoman context proper were those of Shaykh Badr al-Dīn Simāwī (1416),[90] the Ḥurūfīs (1441)[91] and the Jalālīs (1595-1618).[92]

Following the establishment of the Ṣafawid state, which traced its origin to a Ṣūfī order,[93] and its intensive campaign of propaganda among the Turcoman tribes of Anatolia in order to encourage them to rebel against the Ottoman government and Sunnī authorities, the Sulṭāns could ignore the organization and activities of these militant ṭarīqas only at their peril. However, the Ottoman rulers had always been aware of this problem and had viewed the militant ṭarīqas with watchfulness and suspicion.

---

89. C. Cahen, "Bābāī in EI[2], I, pp. 843-4; P. Wittek, op. cit., p. 37.

90. Gölpınarlı, Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin (İstanbul, 1966), pp. 1-10.

91. A. Bausani, op. cit., p. 601; Köprülü, op. cit., pp. 95-6.

92. Cezar, Levendler, pp. 86-98.

93. M. Mazzaoui The Origins of the Safawids, (Wiesbaden, 1972), pp. 58, 71.

The early Sulṭāns also had realized that the Ṣūfī brotherhoods could act as a powerful force for the mobilisation of the population at large. In the case of the established orders, therefore, with which there was always the possibility of fruitful cooperation, sought to co-opt leaders whenever possible. When Sulṭān Murād II (d. 1451) was told that Ḥajjī Bayrām, the founder of the Bayrāmī order, had a large number of followers, he asked Ḥajjī Bayrām to visit the capital, Edirne. Having interviewed him and assured himself that the work of Ḥajjī Bayrām was useful to the state, he even exempted him and his followers from taxation.[94] On the other hand, Murād II's successor, Meḥmed II, the Conqueror, took an opposite line in the case of two important Khalwatī shaykhs, Shaykh Rūshenī and 'Alā al-Dīn Khalwatī. Becoming suspicious at the large number of followers who had gathered around these two shaykhs in the capital, he exiled them from the city.[95]

The primary role and function of the Ṣūfīs, naturally, was a religious one, and their main task was to propagate Islam[96]. in general and to promote the doctrines of their

---

94. Keskin, op. cit., pp. 244-45.

95. Kissling, "Aus der Geschichte des Chalvetijje Orderns" in ZDMG, CII (1953), p. 245.

96. H. Kramers, "Islam in Asia Minor" in Analecta Orientalia (Leiden, 1954), pp. 27, 31; V. Ménage, The Islamisation...; Vryonis, op. cit., p. 363.

orders in particular. Accordingly, this mission of the Ṣūfīs was aimed in two directions; the first was towards Muslims and the second towards non-Muslims. To accomplish the first aim required the teaching of the fundamentals of Islam and of its religious duties to those people who would be offered no alternative opportunity of acquiring this type of education. The Ṣūfīs also accepted the role of training new converts within the framework of the ritual and doctrines of their orders. In this way they played a significant part in the process of the Islamisation of the Christian provinces which were annexed to the state by conquest.[97]

But the concept of Islam as spread by the Ṣūfīs differed from that of Orthodox Islam as taught in the medrese. The Ṣūfīs' approach to Islam often formed "popular religion", while that of the medrese constituted "official religion".[98] "Popular religion" was intermixed with other traditions, customs and beliefs not associated with Islam in its pristine form. Associated with the ṭarīqas were certain practices such as the veneration of saints and tombs, the celebration of certain festivals, and the ritual use of music and dance.[99]

---

97. Barkan, Kolonizator ; Sugar, op. cit., pp. 50-3; Trimingham, op. cit., p. 232.
98. J. Waardenburgh, "Official and Popular Religion in Islam, in Social Compass (1978) XXV, 13-4, pp. 315-41.
99. Trimingham, op. cit., pp. 195, 225-28, 230.

The 'ulamā' however did not remain indifferent to the introduction of such innovatory rituals; on the contrary, they objected strongly. According to Rahman, the criticism and objection of the orthodox 'ulamā' were responsible for the emergence of an orthodox form of Ṣūfism.[100] The Ṣūfīs, because of those rituals and practices, attracted the masses into their ranks by appealing to their hearts and presenting their message in simple and intelligible language, while they drew the intellectuals by cultivating the arts which were either proscribed or neglected by the rigid attitude of the established 'ulamā'. In short, the medrese appealed to the appetite for arid learning which would be rewarded by advancement and promotion through the 'ilmiyye, while the tekke addressed the heart of the novice in a spirit of mystical love. The Ṣūfī sciences were presented as a metaphor for knowledge or love of God, and had a profound influence upon the people and on Muslim civilization.[101]

---

100. F. Rahman, Islam, (London, 1966), pp. 137-40.

101. Arberry, Sufism, (London, 1950), pp. 45-119;
idem "Sufism" in CHI, II, pp. 604-631;
H.A.R. Gibb, Islam (London, 1978), pp. 98-99;
A.M. Schimmel, Mystical Dimensions of Islam (Berkeley, 1978), pp. 338-9; Trimingham, Orders, pp. 218-9.

The Palace and the Tekke

Throughout the Ottoman period, relations between the Palace and the established Ṣūfī orders generally remained close and mutually advantageous. This good relationship was due to a flexible attitude on both sides, with both institutions being prepared to adapt to the changing times. The first Ottoman Sulṭāns, and indeed even the Seljuq Sulṭāns of Rūm before them, had welcomed Ṣūfī leaders to their capitals and encouraged the brotherhoods. In return for political patronage the shaykhs would assure the ruler of their own loyalty and that of their followers.[102]

The Sulṭāns were able, therefore, to exploit the Ṣūfī brotherhoods in several ways. The Ṣūfī leaders had the necessary influence to assure the adherence of the local population to the Ottoman state, and they thus helped in the maintenance of order and stability. Ṣūfīs acted as preachers (wā'iẓ) throughout the Ottoman territories, particularly in the small towns and villages where the influence of the "official" 'ulamā' class did not penetrate. It was natural, therefore, that the Sulṭāns should establish tekkes in every newly-conquered area.[103]

This important relationship was not always harmonious;

---

102. Kara, op. cit., pp. 113-18; Keskin, op. cit., pp. 227-29; Trimingham, op. cit., pp. 239-40.

103. M. Kara, ibid.

it could only be maintained by constant vigilance against elements that were too heterodox for a state which ostensibly had become the guardian of Orthodox Islam.

The traditional analysis of Ottoman society, based upon Lybyer's study of western sources,[104] proposed that the Ottoman state was made up of two institutions, the "ruling institution" and what Lybyer termed the "Muslim institution". However, the scantest perusal of the Ottoman sources forces the scholar to place the ṭarīqas on an equal footing with the other two institutions. The Ottoman state was a combination of three major elements, represented by the army, the medrese and the tekke. The first ruled, the second interpreted the law and provided formal education, while the third provided the social bonding which drew together the various groups within the state. Up to the seventeenth century the two latter groups were largely complementary, the first supplying the formal education required for certain professions, the latter fulfilling the spiritual, cultural, social and educational needs of the masses.

---

104. A. Lybyer, The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Sulaiman the Magnificent (Cambridge, Mass. 1913).

The Medrese and the Tekke

In the formative period of the Ottoman state it would have been difficult to draw a sharp distinction between the 'ulamā' and the Ṣūfī brotherhoods. The first Ottoman müderris (professor), Dāwūd of Kayseri (d. 1351), who taught in Iznik, was instrumental in the dissemination of the ideas of the Andalusian mystic, Ibn 'Arabī (d. 1240) in Anatolia.[105] The first Ottoman Shaykh al-Islām, Mollā Fenārī (d. 1431), too, had close links with Ṣūfism. As a matter of fact, this connection continued throughout the Ottoman period.[106] In the early days of the Ottoman state, Ṣūfism and scholarship were merely two aspects of the same phenomenon, which was the search for knowledge of God. After the conquest of Istanbul, however, and in the centuries that followed, these two aspects evolved into two highly complex institutions, which were clearly separate, although it was not uncommon for individuals to be members of both. By the beginning of the seventeenth century an element of rivalry and competition had intruded into what had remained for so long a harmonious relationship.

The 'ulamā' developed into a highly bureaucratic

---

105. M. Bayrakdar, La Philosophie Mystique de la Réligion chez Dāwūd de Kayseri, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Sorbonne, Paris, 1978, pp. 6-7, 13-14.

106. Kara, op. cit., pp. 65-70.

organization which maintained a great deal of exclusiveness mainly by limiting entry into its ranks to the families of established ʿālims. It became increasingly difficult for outsiders, no matter how gifted, to enter the hierarchy in the face of the blatantly corrupt nepotism practised by the powerful established families.[107] This process naturally undermined the ideal of the Muslim ʿilmiyye, which had traditionally been open to all aspiring men of talent. At the same time, the traditional role of the ṭarīqas as supporters of the Ottoman government and proponents of Islamic propaganda and rule slowly ceased to have real value in the face of strong central government. The orders no longer had the role of establishing a fledgling state and orthodox religious views, but concentrated on ministering to those elements of society which were neglected by the established system. In other words, they offered an alternative spiritual ministry. In doing so they deprived the ʿulamāʾ of a monopoly which they felt was their right. Thus the seeds of the future disagreement between these two institutions, the ʿulamāʾ and the Ṣūfīs, may be traced right back to the early Ottoman period.

This disagreement was demonstrated in the attitude of

---

107. A. Uğur, op. cit., p. LX

the Shaykh al-Islām to the Ṣūfī orders. As holder of the highest position in the 'ilmiyye hierarchy he was the ultimate arbiter of orthodoxy within the state, and as such issued decisions as to whether certain Ṣūfī practices were canonical or not. From the sixteenth century onwards, the Ottoman Shaykh al-Islāms issued different fatwās concerning some Ṣūfī practices, such as samā'. Of course, these fatwās, or official views of the Shaykh al-Islām, were subject to change according to the personalities of the holders of the office at different times, as well as the trends of thought at different periods. As a result, there was no consensus of the Shaykh al-Islāms on any particular issue. The Shaykh al-Islām 'Alī Jamālī[108] (d. 1525) composed two risālas in favour of dawarān and samā',[109] while Abu 'l-Su'ūd (d. 982/1574)[110] issued a fatwā which was entirely contradictory to that of his predecessor on the same issue.[111] Ibn Kemāl (d. 940/1534),[112]

---

108. Repp, op. cit., p. 276.

109. A. Jamālī, Devrān-ı Ṣūfiyyenin cevāzina dā'ir risāla, Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS M. 'Arif, 221/2; A. Jamālī, Risāla fī al-dhikr al-jahrī wa'l-dawarān, Süleymaniye Library, İstanbul, MS Es'ad Ef. 1761/6, ff. 54-57.

110. Repp, op. cit., p. 341.

111. Cf. ch. VI, below.

112. Repp, op. cit., p. 236.

on the other hand, was equivocal in his attitude. While he defended the reputation of Ibn 'Arabī, and considered him as al-Shaykh al-Akbar,[113] he also issued a fatwā proscribing dawarān and samā'.[114] Although individual Shaykh al-Islāms varied in their views on the Ṣūfīs, their attitude was generally moderate, in that they tried to maintain some sort of equilibrium between the Ṣūfīs and their puritanical opponents.[115]

Amongst the rest of the 'ulamā' class the same equivocal attitude is also to be found. Certain independent scholars, such as Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 1549), Qinalı-zāde 'Alī (d. 1570), Birgiwī Meḥmed (1574) and Sünbül Sinān expressed their opinions on Ṣūfī practices either through independent risalās or in their major works.

---

113. Kara, op. cit., p. 79; Ibn Kemāl, Fatāwā fi haqq Ibn 'Arabī, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Es'ad Ef. 1694/3, fol. 11.

114. Ibn Kemāl, Fatāwā al-Raqṣ, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Es'ad Ef. 696/3, ff. 36-39.

115. For more detail on the subject see E. Kaydu, Die Institution des Scheyh ul-Islamat im Osmanischen Staat, Nürnberg 1971, pp. 90-105.

While Birgiwī and al-Ḥalabī condemned Ṣūfī practices,[116] Qinalı-zāde 'Alī and Sünbül Sinān defended them.[117] As a result, all these developments in the sixteenth century demonstrate that the role of the Ṣūfīs in society was no longer accepted without question. However, it was only in the following century that these doubts flared up into open dispute and violence.

An attempt will now be made to examine the relationship between the <u>medrese</u> and the <u>tekke</u>, during the seventeenth century, in order to isolate some of the underlying causes of the Qāḍī-zādelis controversy. As has been mentioned already, although a certain amount of tension existed between the representatives of the <u>medrese</u> and the <u>tekke</u> throughout Islamic history in general and in the Ottoman state in particular, this smouldering conflict was fanned into flames by the introduction of two new items, coffee and tobacco, into the Muslim world. These novelties were added to other subjects of dispute and their arrival revived and exacerbated chronic disputes which had long lain dormant.

As will be seen later,[118] the arrival of coffee in

---

116. Birgiwī, <u>al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya</u>, (İstanbul, 1289), pp. 166-7; al-Ḥalabī, <u>al-Rahṣ wa'l-Waqṣ li-Muṣtahill al-Raqṣ</u>, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Es'ad Ef. ff. 222-232.

117. Cf. ch. VII below.

118. Cf. ch. VII below.

Istanbul during the mid-sixteenth century and the introduction of tobacco at the beginning of the seventeenth century forced the Ottoman *'ulamā'* at large and the *Shaykh al-Islāms* in particular to pass judgement concerning their legality or illegality. The *Shaykh al-Islām* Yaḥyā Ef. and Bahā'i Ef. favoured the legitimacy of tobacco while coffee was already considered legal by the end of the sixteenth century. But at the same time Bahā'i Ef., like his predecessors, Ibn Kemāl and Abu 'l-Su'ūd, condemned the Sūfī practice of *samā'* or *dawarān* which was regarded as innovatory and irreligious by the orthodox *'ulamā'*. At this period, many of the *'ulamā'* were attracted towards material possessions and living in luxury and extravagance. This was in contrast to the Ṣūfīs who were content with what they had already. These novelties, coffee and tobacco, were eagerly adopted by the Ṣūfīs in general and the Khalwatiyya in particular, who used them as stimulants and popularized them. Their appearance, however, presented difficulties for the *'ulamā'* in that they were charged with deciding on their legality. In doing so, it was natural that such decisions should be interpreted as favouring or discriminating against the Ṣūfī brotherhoods. The application for a *fatwā* on such novelties seems to have encouraged similar requests for judgements on the so-called *bida'*s which had a longer history, practices which were peculiar to the Ṣūfīs, such as *dawarān*, *samā'* and musical recitation. Although there were exceptions, the majority of the *'ulamā'* by their

fatwās expressed approval of these practices.

The Qāḍī-zādelis, on the other hand, did not participate in the consensus which approved these novelties. They continued to oppose these practices and increasingly resorted to direct appeals to the people to achieve their goals. In the course of the seventeenth century, therefore, three points of view emerged: firstly that of the Ṣūfīs, who embraced these novelties, secondly the Qāḍī-zādelis, who were violently opposed to them, and finally the *'ulamā'*,[119] who found it increasingly difficult to steer an even course through the violent factions. The *'ulamā'* were responsible for the maintenance of orthodoxy and social order. While the former responsibility would have steered them in the direction of the Qāḍī-zādelis, the violent tactics and demagogy of this latter group tended to push them more towards the Ṣūfīs, whose role in the disputes was far more passive. The populace at large tended to be confused by the sophistic arguments bandied about in the debates, and increasingly adopted the partisanship of one of the

---

119. Although the Qāḍī-zādelis (or at least their leaders) were all members of the lesser *'ulamā'*, their attitude differed so markedly from those of the *'ulamā'* as a whole that in this thesis they have been consistently treated as a distinct group.

two opposing factions for social, cultural and emotional reasons, rather than from a conviction based on the validity of the arguments. The result was a tendency towards polarisation in the society of the time.

CHAPTER IV

THE QĀḌĪ-ZĀDE MOVEMENT : THE FIRST PHASE

Historical Background

Every human society, it has been said, passes through several stages of development, until eventually it reaches its zenith, this process being the result of forces implicit within it. The cultural aspects of this go in parallel with other transformations of the society, but their pace may at times be accelerated by influences coming from other societies and civilisations. If the recipient system is able to absorb these foreign elements without abandoning its own innate character the result is fruitful and beneficial; but, on the other hand, if their introduction necessitates the distortion or abandonment of fundamental values, stresses and tendencies are set up which may pull apart the very fabric of its structure. When the society in question is Islamic - which is to say, one based uniquely on principles which have their origin in the Islamic religion - the introduction of extraneous cultural influences will always be examined in the light of whether they might adversely affect the faith, either by encouraging uncanonical practices or beliefs, or by undermining the integrity of the umma.

It fell to the 'ulamā', as the official guardians of orthodoxy, to be vigilant in protecting their communities from harmful innovations; and the religious history of Islam, in every period and in every region, demonstrates the efforts made to this end in numerous hortatory tracts and treatises, which in turn were the response to what was felt to be a contamination of the true faith. Such

writings were either reformist or revivalist in nature, and although they have much in common, they nevertheless are distinct in the purpose which they seek to achieve. Reformist movements are usually to be found in those periods of economic crisis and political weakness when the moral fibre of the community shows visible signs of disintegration, whereas revivalism directs its attention to the more insidious features which affect the very bases of religion by inducing carelessness and laxity in the observance of prescribed practices. In both such periods there unfailingly appeared on the scene religious teachers who sought to redirect the currents of social behaviour back into the traditional channels of what they regarded as true Islamic belief, holding to a puritanical morality and the ideal of the good society.

As the only valid basis for a healthy political and social life was held by these teachers to reside in religion, it was natural that they should focus their attention on matters of creed and doctrine rather than attack specific abuses in administration which could be seen as deriving ultimately from deeper moral defects. Beginning with Ibn Taymiyya in the thirteenth century, and to a great extent influenced by his example, every subsequent generation produced its religious reformers, often men of great moral courage who were prepared to challenge the temporal power and to defy the general opinion of their communities.

Although the influence of Ibn Taymiyya on reform

movements throughout other regions of the Islamic world has received its due attention,[1] there has as yet been no scholarly attempt to assess its importance among the Ottomans. According to the Ottoman historians (whose view has hitherto been followed by modern scholars), the Qāḍī-zāde movement was a renewal of the age-long controversy between two important classes in the Islamic community: the *ʻulamāʼ* and the Ṣūfīs. It should also be seen as a movement of socio-religious reform, and in this respect it continues the efforts in this direction started by Ibn Taymiyya in the thirteenth century.[2] The influence of Ibn Taymiyya on Birgiwī Meḥmed Efendi is apparent, and it is the teaching of Birgiwī which underlies the doctrines of the Qāḍī-zādelis. It will be shown that, in their attacks on the Ṣūfīs, the adherents of this movement were concerned at the same time to reform the society in which

---

1. H. Laoust, *Doctrines Sociales et Politiques d'Ibn Taimīya* (Cairo, 1939); *idem*, "L'Influence d'Ibn Taymiyya" in T. Welch - P. Cachia (eds.) *Islam; Past Influence and Present Challenge* (Edinburgh, 1979), pp. 15-33; J. Rosenthal, *Islam in the Modern National State* (Cambridge, 1965), p. 15; M. Kerr, *Islamic Reform* (California, 1956).
2. F. Rahman, "Revival and Reform in Islam" in *C.H.I.* II, p. 640; A.S. Al-ʻUthaymīn, *Muḥammad ibn ʻAbd al-Wahhāb : The man and his works*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh, 1973, pp. 285-7.

they lived, the evils and defects of which they saw as arising from a departure from the traditional virtues of Islam and the acceptance of such innovations as were tolerated among the Ṣūfīs.

Since Birgiwī Meḥmed Efendi may be regarded as the source from which the Qāḍī-zāde movement developed, it will be useful to give here a brief account of his life and his works.

Birgiwī's Life [929/1523 - 981/1573]

Meḥmed b. Pīr ʻAlī, commonly known as İmām Birgiwī or Birgiwī Meḥmed, was born on 10 Jum I 929/27 March 1523), in Balikesir, where his father, Pīr ʻAlī, was a müderris. His mother's name was Meryem, and apart from this we have no other information on his family.[3]

Coming from a learned family, Birgiwī received his first education from his father at home, after which he attended the local medrese. When he had completed the

---

3. The main sources of biographical information on Birgiwī are:
N. ʻAṭā'ī, Dhayl Shaqā'iq al-Nuʻmāniyya, (İstanbul, 1282), p. 172; E. Yüksel, Les idées religieuses et politiques de Meḥmed al-Birkéwī (929-981/1523-73), unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Sorbonne, 1972; idem, "Mehmet Birgivî" (929-981/1523-73), in Atatürk Üniversitesi İslâmī İlimler Fakültesi Dergisi, II (1977), pp. 175-83.

education provided there, he left for İstanbul to continue his studies under scholars of reputation. He entered the Thāmaniyya Medrese where he studied first under Akhī-zāde Meḥmed Efendi (d. 989/1581) and then Qāḍī-ʻasker ʻAbd al-Raḥmān Efendi (d. 1001/1591). Having finished his studies, he received his mülāzemet from his master, ʻAbd al-Raḥmān Ef., and entered the academic career in a teaching post in one of the medreses of İstanbul. It is not known how long he had been in this post when, again through the influence of his master, he was appointed as qassām-ı ʻaskerī[4] in Edirne, an office which dealt with the estates of deceased soldiers.

While he was in Edirne, he decided to enter a ṭarīqa, and came to İstanbul, where he associated himself with the Bayramiyya dervish order[5] and spent some time under the spiritual guidance of Shaykh ʻAbd al-Raḥmān of Qaramān (d. 977/1515),[6] dressing in the white garments which this order prescribed. At some point during this period he relinquished the post of qassām and made a trip to Edirne in order to hand over the funds he had received from the

---

4. For this office see Pakalın, op. cit., II, p. 270; Uzunçarşılı, İT, p. 121.

5. On this order see A. Gölpınarlı, "Bayramiya" in IA, II, pp. 423-6; G. Lewis, "Bayrāmiyya" in EI², I, p. 1137.

6. ʻAṭāʼī, p. 179; Kātib Čelebī, Mīzān, p. 105.

sale of deceased soldiers' property to those entitled to them.[7] Birgiwī, with his rational mind, could not adjust himself to a way of life (i.e. that of the ṭarīqa) which completely differed from his previous life style. Understanding this, Shaykh Qaramānī advised him to return to teaching and preaching.

Although it is not clear from the available sources what were the immediate reasons for his leaving the Ṣūfī way of life, some authors, such as Uzunçarşılı and Yurdaydın,[8] suggest that Birgiwī left the ṭarīqa because he was unable to accept the theory of "waḥdat al-wujūd"[9] on which the Bayramiyya order was based. In fact, he did not entirely abandon Ṣūfism, but he felt that to stay in a tekke and occupy himself in spiritual purification was a selfish act, at a time when many innovations and non-Islamic practices were taking place in society. Shaykh Qaramānī, who knew Birgiwī and his abilities, might have thought that if Birgiwī returned to teaching and preaching he would be very useful to the community. What these objectionable innovations were, and the degree to which they had penetrated the Muslim community, may be gathered

---

7. K. Kufralı, "Birgewī" in EI[2], I, p. 1253 and also in İA

8. Uzunçarşılı, OT, vol. iii, part i, p. 363; H. Yurdaydın, İslam tarihi Dersleri (Ankara, 1971), p. 125.

9. İ. Fennī, Waḥdat Wujūd wa Muḥyī 'l Dīn ʻArabi, (İstanbul, 1928).

from Birgiwī's own works.

When ʻAṭāʼ ʻUllāh Efendi, the tutor of Selim II, built a _dār al-ḥadīth_[10] in Birgi in the province of Aydın,[11] he appointed Birgiwī as its _müderris_, with a stipend of 60 akçe per day. There were probably political motives behind this appointment of Birgiwī. No doubt the authorities in Istanbul felt relieved to have this uncompromising fundamentalist far away from the capital. Here Birgiwī settled down and worked for the rest of his life. In a short time he became well-known and received students from all over the Ottoman territories, devoting himself to teaching, preaching and writing. He regarded as his special mission the defence of the _sharīʻa_ and the _sunna_ against innovations and non-Islamic practices. Towards the end of his life, he went to Istanbul where he

---

10. A considerable number of Ottoman _medreses_ bear the name _dār al-ḥadīth_. The position of these _dār al-ḥadīth_ within the entire _medrese_ system has yet to be clearly established. But it would appear (see Baltacı, _op. cit._, especially pages 20-1) that the _dār al-ḥadīth_ was a specialized type of _medrese_ concentrating on the teaching of sciences connected with _ḥadīth_. Baltacı suggests that, as in the case of the general _medreses_, there were different grades of _dār al-ḥadīth_.
11. Baltacı, _Medreseler_, pp. 583-4.

discussed certain problems with the Grand Vizier Soqullu Meḥmed Pasha and asked him to put an end to the degeneration which was threatening the moral life of Islamic society. When he returned to Birgi he fell victim to the plague, and died on I Jam. I 981 (1 August 1573). His grave is in Birgi.[12]

The Works of Birgiwī

Birgiwī produced works in Arabic and Turkish on a wide variety of subjects, including fiqh, tafsīr, ʻaqāʼıd akhlāq, Arabic grammar, Ṣūfısm and other topics.[13]

The Waṣīyyat-nāme and al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya are his most famous works and both have enjoyed a high reputation since the time they first appeared. His books on Arabic grammar, the Iẓhār and the ʻAwāmil, have been widely used for the teaching of the elementary language.

---

12. Yüksel, op. cit., p. 83; M.A. Aynī, Türk Ahlakçıları, (İstanbul, 1939), pp. 108-51.

    It is ironic that the tomb of Birgiwī, who was so resolute an opponent of the veneration of the burial places of saints and holy men, is today an object of popular visitation and prayers. In this he shares the same fate as his predecessor Ibn Taymiyya.

13. N. Atsız, İstanbul Kütüphanelerine göre Birgili Meḥmed Ef. (929-981) (1523-1573) Bibliyografyası (İstanbul, 1963), p. 2; Yüksel, op. cit., ch. I.

i) The Waṣīyyat-nāme is a catechism (ʻilm-iḥāl) also known as the "Risāla-i Birgiwī" which was written around 970/1562. It discusses imān, ʻibādet, akhlāq and taṣawwuf, in a very concise and convenient form. Written in Turkish, it became a popular handbook, and down to the present it is still widely read among certain pious classes. It attracted many commentaries and was translated into French in 1882 by Garcin de Tassy.[14]

ii) Al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya[15] was completed on 27 Shaʻbān 981/31 December 1572. This was his last and most important work. It is in simple Arabic and deals with akhlāq, taṣawwuf and matters concerning the prescriptions of the sharīʻa and the sunna. In form it is a vade-mecum for preachers and writers of homilies. This, too, has received many commentaries and glosses.[16]

The book is composed in three sections (bāb), each divided into several chapters. The first bāb treats the Qur'ān and the sunna; the second is mainly concerned with the pious life: what things should be observed and what should be avoided. The third bāb is mainly devoted to explaining the attitudes of various madhāhib to certain practices, ending with a brief recommendation that certain

---

14. Atsız, op. cit., pp. 5-11; Kufralı, in EI², I, p. 1253.

15. The full title of the work is al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya fī Sīrat al-Ahmadiyya (İstanbul, 1287).

16. A. Aynī, op. and loc. cit; Yüksel, op. cit. ch. I.

of his other works be read, in order that non-canonical innovations may be avoided. The most important of these innovations are held to be of two kinds: paying for prayers or Qur'ānic recitations and making waqf endowments in cash.[17]

These two works must be regarded as Birgiwī's most important contributions to religious literature, and they are the basis on which his fame rests. His other monographs are particularly devoted to the exposure of what he considered to be unauthorised innovations in his own time, and of these he specifically mentions four at the end of the Ṭarīqat.[18] These are as follows:-[19]

1. Jilā' al-qulūb. This deals with innovations introduced into religion through taṣawwuf. Birgiwī's conception of the latter, as might be expected, is strictly orthodox, and he demands that it adhere unswervingly to the sharī'a and the sunna. His main attack is against those false

---

17. Birgiwī, al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya (İstanbul, 1287), pp. 218-9. For a full discussion on the subject see J.E. Mandaville, "Usurious Piety : The cash waqf controversy in the Ottoman Empire" IJMES, X (1979), pp. 289-308.
18. Birgiwī, op. cit., p. 219.
19. The four risālas listed here were included in a lithographed collection published in İstanbul by the Ṣahhāflar Ketkhudāsı Es'ad Efendi in the late nineteenth century.

Ṣūfīs of the age, whose ignorance leads them into uncanonical practices and whose behaviour brings true taṣawwuf into disrepute. He describes the way of life and doctrines of the early Ṣūfīs in order to show that in the age in which he was living there were few Ṣūfīs to be found who possessed those characteristics.

2. Inqādh al-Hālikīn. This insists on the illegality of making cash endowments, other than at the time of death, in order to secure a spiritual reward. This risāla was refuted by a fatwā delivered by the famous Abu 'l-Su'ūd Ef., in which he based his decision on a statement of the Imām Ẓufar (d. 775). Birgiwī, however, responded to Abū 'l-Su'ūd in a work entitled Sayf al-Ṣārım. In this he maintained that Abū 'l-Su'ūd was in error and that the Imām's judgement was based on weak traditions (aḥadīth). He reasserts his position that waqfs of money should not be made lest the endower unintentionally fall into sin (because of the usury involved) while seeking to acquire spiritual merit. Birgiwī intended that his statement, and not the fatwā of Abu 'l-Su'ūd, should be the guide to orthodox practices for judges dealing with such cases.[20]

3. Īqāẓ al-nā'imīn wa ifhām al-qāṣırīn. This attacks the common practice of paying to have the Qur'ān recited or prayers said for oneself or a deceased relative.

---

20. For a full discussion of this issue see Mandaville, op. cit.

Birgiwī maintains that such use of money is condemned by every _madhhab_ and has no place in any religion.

4. _Ziyārat al-qubūr._ The work is based on the _Ighāthat al-Lahfān_ of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzī, and it explains the canonical limits on the visitation of the tombs of holy men. Birgiwī condemns such prevalent practices as praying to the person buried, lighting candles and sacrificing animals, none of which have any sanction or validity in Orthodox Islam.

Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed[21] [c. 990/1582 (?) - 1045/1635]

a) Qāḍī-zāde's Life

Al-Shaykh Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed Ef. b. Ṭoghānī Muṣṭafā Ef., commonly known as Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed or Küčük (young) Qāḍī-zāde, was born in Balikesir, where his father, Ṭoghānī Muṣṭafā, was a qāḍī. No date of birth or further information relating to his origin is given in the sources.[22] Nevertheless, it is possible for us to estimate the date of his birth from the fact that he was over fifty when he died in 1045/1635.[23] If we accept fifty-five as a medial figure for his age at that date, he would have been born about the year 990/1582.[24]

Being the son of a qāḍī, Meḥmed Ef. received his

---

21. Other 'ulamā' and officials in the Ottoman sources have the same laqab, and therefore in order to prevent confusion this Qāḍī-zāde was referred to as Küčük Qāḍī-zāde. Büyük Qāḍī-zāde was also a shaykh and Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed Ef. succeeded him in the Ayasofya in 1041/1631.
22. Kātib Čelebi, Fadhlaka, II, pp. 182-3; idem, Mīzān al-Ḥaqq, pp. 107-109, 110-1; 'Ushāqī-zāde, pp. 43-4; OM, I, p. 402; SO, IV, p. 142; H'A, II, p. 277.
23. Only the Mīzān mentions that this was his age at the time of his death.
24. Uzunçarşılı also says, without giving any reference, that he was born in 990. See OT, III, part 1, pp. 364.

first education at home from his father, and afterwards he advanced his studies under some former students of Meḥmed Birgiwī (d. 981/1573). Naturally, during this period of his studies he would have heard about Birgiwī Meḥmed and his works. It is most likely that he studied some of his works.

To continue his studies, Meḥmed Ef. left his native town and came to İstanbul, where he became a pupil of Ṭursun-zāde ʿAbd Allah Ef. and later acted as his mu'īd.[25] The sources are uninformative about his age at this time and the medrese in which he studied. ʿAṭā'ī's article on Ṭursun-zāde ʿAbd Allāh allows the assumption that Qāḍī-zāde might have been his student some time between the years 1005/1596 or 1009/1600.[26] If we accept his date of birth as 990/1582, it is very likely that he could have studied with Ṭursun-zāde before 1008/1599. Perhaps the year 1008/1599, when Ṭursun-zāde was teaching in the Thamāniyya is the most likely date. It is noteworthy that at this time(1597-99) the normal period of study in the

---

25. Acting as assistant to him, repeating the lectures for students. See Baltacı, Medreseler Uzunçarşılı, IT, pp. 7-9.

26. According to ʿAṭā'ī, Ṭūrsūn-zāde taught in several medreses before his appointment as a qāḍī in 1010/1601. The dates and list of the medreses are as follows:

1001 - Nishānji Meḥmed Medrese
1004 - Edirne Kapısı Medrese
1005 - Ghazanfar Agha

Ottoman medreses was severely reduced in order to accommodate the large number of students who, as a result of the disturbed social conditions, wanted to enter the ʿulamāʾ career.[27] This solution to the problem of accommodating potential students caused a decline in the quality of education.[28]

On completing his studies, Qāḍī-zāde chose to become a preacher (wāʿiẓ) and began giving sermons in the mosques of İstanbul. The sources relating to this period do not mention any specific mosque or place. However, after preaching for a while, Qāḍī-zāde was attracted to the Ṣūfī way of life, an attitude which was not uncommon among the Ottoman ʿulamāʾ. Through the influence and encouragement of the well-known Khalwati Shaykh (Tarjumān Shaykhi) ʿÖmer Ef. (d. 1033/1623),[29] he associated himself with this ṭarīqa and became his mürīd, spending some time in spiritual purification. Kātib Čelebi, a pupil of Qāḍī-zāde, narrates this event as follows:

> "He then chose the career of a Ṣūfī shaykh, entering the service of ʿOmer Efendi, Shaykh of the Tarjumān lodge (tekke) and occupying himself

---

1008 - Ṣaḥn-ı Thamān
1009 - Walide Sulṭān Med. Üsküdār
1010 - Qāḍī to Jerusalem, ʿAtāʾi, pp. 533-4.

27. See Baltacı, Medreseler, pp. 37-41. Cf. above, chapter II, p.76

28. Baltacı, Medreseler, pp. 61-71.

29. ʿAṭāʾī, p. 758; Fadhlaka, II, p. 64.

with spiritual purification. Finding however that the Ṣūfī path did not suit his temperament, he adopted the way of speculation."[30]

Thus, after an unspecified period as a mürīd, he realized that the Ṣūfī life was not for him; he therefore returned to his previous occupation. This presumably took place in the early years of his professional life, and it is possible that the friendship between himself and 'Ömer Ef., both of them being preachers in Istanbul, was the reason for his entering the ṭarīqa.

It is very likely that Qāḍī-zāde's first appointment after his return to preaching was in the Murād Pasha Mosque, where he held study circles and taught some classical Islamic books, such as the Jāmī,[31] the Ṣadr al-Sharī'a[32] and the Mukhtaṣar.[33] Through the quality of his teaching and his moving sermons he gained fame and reputation. Afterwards, he was appointed preacher in the Sulṭān Selīm Mosque, where he succeeded Birgiwī-zāde Faḍl Allāh Ef.

---

30. Balance, p. 132; Mizān, p. 121; cf. also Fadhlaka, II, p. 64.

31. A work of al-Jāmī (d. 898/1492); see Brockelmann, GAL, II, pp. 266-7. It is a work on Arabic language.

32. A work of Maḥmūd ibn Ṣadr al-Sharī'a, Wiqāyat al-riwāya fī masā'il al-hidāya; see GAL, I, p. 376 S, I, p. 646, Hanafite law.

33. Al-Mukhtaṣar is a work of Muḥammad al-Qudūrī of Baghdad (d. 1037); see GAL, I, p. 175; KZ, II, p. 1631 on Hanafite law.

(d. 1032/1622),[34] and after spending some time there, he was promoted to the Fātiḥ Mosque around 1038/1628. Kātib Čelebi one day happened to hear a sermon which he was giving, and this influenced him to become his pupil for the study of the religious sciences. Later, in 1032/1622-3, Kātib Čelebi returned to him for further study and read such classical works as Iḥyā' 'ulūm al-Dīn,[35] a commentary on al-Mawāqif,[36] Durar[37] and Ṭarīqat.[38] He does not mention where this study was conducted, though it was probably again in the Fātiḥ Mosque.

In 1032/1622-3, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed was transferred to Sulṭān Bayazīd Mosque, where he succeeded Shaykh Faḍl Allāh Ef.[39] for the second time. He stayed there until he was given the Süleymāniye Mosque where he replaced

---

34. 'Aṭā'ī, p. 675.
35. The well-known work of al-Ghazālī.
36. A work of 'Aḍud al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad al-Ījī (d. 1355); it is on theology.
37. A work of Molla Khusraw, a commentary on his other work Ghurār, see İT, p. 229; GAL, S, II, p. 316 on law.
38. Birgiwī's famous work al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya.
39. 'Atā'ī, op. cit.

Shaykh Muṣṭafā Ef. (d. 1041/1631) in Jam. II 1041/August 1631.[40] Here he stayed until the death in 1041 of Shaykh Meḥmed Ef.[41] known as Büyük Qāḍī-zāde, the wā'iẓ of the Ayasofya Mosque, provided the opportunity for "Küçük" Qāḍī-zāde to replace him there.

In 1045/1635 he accompanied the Sulṭān for the Rewān campaign, but on reaching Konya he became ill and returned to Istanbul where he died on 26 Rab' II 1045/9 October 1635. His burial prayer was performed in the Fātiḥ Mosque and he was buried outside Yenikapı, in the manner which he had wanted, without dhikr and tahlīl.[42]

The chronogram of his death is:

[43] (1045) اولیاو قاضیزاده اولدی واه

---

40. 'Atā'ī, pp. 764-5.

41. 'Atā'ī, p. 765.

42. Na'īmā, III, p. 261; Fadhlaka, II, p. 182.

43. Fadhlaka, II, p. 182.

Dhikr is the repeated utterance of certain religious formulae, of which tahlīl refers specifically to the formula lā ilāha illā 'llāh. Qāḍī-zāde's attitude to dhikr is set out in his risāla Dhikr-i Jahrī (see below, p.159). He was against such utterances being made in a loud voice. Qāḍī-zāde and his successors Üsṭüwānī and Wānī specifically denounced the practice of loud dhikr during funeral processions. See Qāḍī-zāde, Dhikr-i Jahrī, fol. 5a.
Üsṭüwānī, Kitāb-ı Üsṭüwānī, fol. 109b-110a.
Wānī, Muhyī'al-sunna wa mumīt, fol. 22a-b.

b. Qāḍī-zāde's Personal Qualities and Attitudes

The information available about Qāḍī-zāde's personality and character is very scant and sometimes contradictory, but we may nevertheless glean some idea as to what sort of man he was.

According to Kātib Čelebi, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed was both ẓarīf (quick-witted) and 'ārif (knowing, wise) and in order to gain reputation acted on the principle of "oppose, and win fame". He revived the old disputes between the 'ulamā' and the Ṣūfīs.[44] His protracted arguments with the Ṣūfīs of his day brought him to the attention of Sulṭān Murād IV through whose friendship and support he became notable among his contemporaries. Kātib Čelebi accuses Qāḍī-zāde of insincerity in his opinions, suggesting that he used such polemics as a trap for the unwary.[45] Having been his pupil, Kātib Čelebi may be right to some extent, but Qāḍī-zāde's works would contradict his assessment. Had Qāḍī-zāde not been sincere in his beliefs, he would not have succeeded in composing well-argued scholarly works in support of his position, nor would he have convinced a Sulṭān like Sulṭān Murād IV.[46]

Qāḍī-zāde had a powerful memory and was capable of supporting his arguments with opposite quotations from the

---

44. Mizān, p. 112.

45. Balance, p. 137.

46. See below, pp.171-3

acknowledged authorities on any occasion. He was also swift of reply in argument and clever in discomfiting an opponent. Moreover, Qāḍī-zāde appears to have been an effective teacher and preacher. Indeed, his fame and reputation were originally due to his success in these activities. He used his sermons in order to pursue his dispute with Siwāsī and other Ṣūfī shaykhs of the time.[47]

As a teacher, he employed his deep knowledge of the Islamic sciences not only against his opponents but also for the people in general. He therefore not only preached but he also taught in the mosques of Istanbul. His teaching was based on faith in its simplest expression. He did not enter into philosophical considerations, on which, in fact, he was not well informed. During his teaching, when he came across any kind of philosophical statement he used to recite these verses:

> "Who'd give a farthing for philosophy?
> Before it what shrewd banter bows the knee?"

and

> "Who sheds a tear if a logician dies?"[48]

These verses epitomise the attitude held by Qāḍī-zāde and his followers towards the rational sciences.

As a scholar, he was practical rather than academic in dealing with the problems of his own time. His works are

---

47. Balance, p. 136; Fadhlaka, loc. cit.

48. Balance, loc. cit.

mainly on the subjects on which his opinions differed from the Ṣūfīs. These were basically matters which he regarded as innovations and departures from orthodoxy. Although a confidant of the Sulṭān, he did not hesitate to speak out on those aspects of society which he found objectionable, and in particular, the corruption and bribery which were then prevalent. In his risālas he shows the influence of Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzī and Birgiwī.

The Works of Qāḍī-zāde

1. Irshād al-ʿUqūl al-mustaqīma ilā ʾl-uṣūl al-qawīma bi-ibṭāl al-bidʿa al-saqīma.[49] This work was written in Arabic and has no date of completion. It should be considered as one of the major works of Qāḍī-zāde, in which he classified his views on certain controversial issues arising between the ʿulamāʾ and the Ṣūfīs.

The work is divided into four chapters (bāb), in each of which the author discusses a problem and explains what he regards as the view which accords with the sharīʿa. He quotes extensively from the earlier ʿulamāʾ in support of his position.

The four chapters are:

a) Radd al-risāla. This is an attempt to refute the views of Shaykh al-Islām ʿAli Čelebi (Zenbillī) (d. 1526) on the

49. See Brockelmann, GAL, II, p. 574.

permissibility of samā' and raqṣ.[50] Qāḍī-zāde collects here all the evidence from the writings of earlier 'ulamā' and tries to prove that raqṣ and samā' are not permitted in Islām. Indeed, this issue had been a matter of dispute since its first appearance in Islam.

b) Fī wujūb al-ittibā' wa'l-iḥtirāz 'ani 'l-ibtidā'. This deals with bid'a (innovation) and the danger such innovations hold for Islam.

c) Fī mudhammat al-mubtadi'īn al-fujjār wa'l-raqqāṣīn al-Ishrāz. This is very similar to the first chapter.

d) Fī wujūb al-taqwā wa tafsīrihā wa majārīhā. This deals with taqwā (piety), its sources, interpretation and importance. The risāla demonstrates how well-informed the author was on the subject and his talent for organizing his arguments methodically.[51]

---

50. 'Ali Čelebi composed two risālas, Risāla fī al-dhikr al-jahrī wa'l dawarān, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hasan Hüsnü Paşa, no. 771/3, ff. 54-7; idem, Risāla fī istiḥbab dawarān al-Ṣūfiyya, Millet Library, MS. A/135 ff. 28b-36a.

51. Qāḍī-zāde, Irshād al-'uqūl, Süleymaniye Library, MS Fatih, 5407/2. Brockelmann mentions only two copies of this work; see GAL, II, p. 574; ZDMG, 91 (1937), 382. The Süleymaniye copy was found by me.

2. Qāmi'at al-bid'a nāṣirat al-sunna dāmighat al-mubtada'a. This is also in Arabic and likewise without a date of compilation. In fact, it is a continuation of Qāḍī-zāde's first risāla on bid'a. Here he deals with the innovation of performing nawāfil prayers in congregation on certain days of some months, such as the first Friday of Rajab, the fifteenth of Sha'bān and the twenty-seventh of Ramaḍān, Laylat al-qaḍr. The author argues that it is not permitted to pray the nawāfil in congregation on particular days but this is allowable for the tarāwīḥ in Ramaḍān.[52]

3. Tāj al-rasā'il wa minhāj al-wasā'il. This was written in Turkish and presented to Sulṭān Murād IV. The risāla is in four parts. The first is an introduction to the translation of Ibn Taymiyya's work, al-Siyāsat al-shar'iyya fī iṣlāḥ al-rā'ī wa 'l-ra'iyya. The second is the translation of Ibn Taymiyya's work. The third part contains Qāḍī-zāde's own observations on 'ibadāt, mu'āmalāt and 'uqūbāt. After explaining these terms very briefly, he discusses the position of non-Muslim subjects and their rights in an Islamic society, giving examples from early Islamic history. He next treats kharāj and jizya and then passes to the nature of the bayt al-māl and its sources of revenue. As for the fourth part, it deals with a work by Aristotle on the arts of war and

---

52. Qāḍī-zāde, Qāmi'at al-bid'a, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Birinci Serez, 3876.

methods of fighting (آداب حرب [و] اسلوب جنك). This *risāla* has an important place among Qāḍī-zāde's works, because in presenting it to the Sulṭān himself the author's intention was clearly to point out to him that the country should be ruled in accordance with the *Qur'ān* and *sunna*. The solution to the problems of Ottoman society, according to Qāḍī-zāde, lay in a return to the *Sharī'a* and the abolition of all innovations and non-Islamic practices.[53]

4. *Qaṣīda*. Apart from his *risāla*, Qāḍī-zāde also composed poems in Turkish and Arabic. Of these, only one complete example has come down to us, a *qaṣīda* which, according to 'Alī Emirī, was presented to Sulṭān Murād IV around 1040/1630. It describes the situation of the state and what the people were suffering as a result of corruption, bribery and favouritism, and suggests solutions to the problems and difficulties which the Ottoman administration and society were facing at that time. 'Alī Emirī suggests that the *qaṣīda* impressed the

---

53. Qāḍī-zāde, *Tāj al-Rasā'il* Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hacı Mahmud Ef. no. 1926. A.S. Levend, in his article "Siyāset-nāmeler", wrongly attributes this work to Qāḍī-zāde 'Ilmī Meḥmed Ef. (d. 1045/1635); see, *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* (1962/63), p. 179.

Sulṭān and influenced him to launch the Rewān campaign.[54] It is of some historical importance in that it presents a real description of the seventeenth-century Ottoman state and its society and demonstrates that Qāḍī-zāde, as an intellectual of his age, was well aware of the problems facing the state and that he attempted to publicise them.[55]

5. Kitāb al-maqbūl fī ḥāl al-khuyūl[56] Qāḍī-zāde's work on horses and their treatment was presented to Sulṭān ʿOthmān II (reigned 1618-1622). The work is divided into four chapters, with an introduction and conclusion.

---

54. The author by describing the conditions of reʿayā in the eastern Anatolia might have urged the Sulṭān to launch the campaign.

55. ʿA. Emīrī, ʿOthmānlı Tārīkh we Edebiyyāt Mejmūʿası, II (İstanbul, 1335) 14, pp. 278-82. ʿAlī Emīrī states that the author of the qaṣīda was the Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed who had the pen-name "ʿIlmī". In fact, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed ʿIlmī Ef. never came to the capital; see OM, I, p.153, and cf. n. 53 above.
A full discussion on the qaṣīda is in the section on Qāḍī-zāde's proposals for reforms.

56. KZ, II, p. 1461 and OM, I, p. 401 gives the title of the work as above, but the copy in the British Museum (MS. Add. 7901) has the title Kitāb-ı Maqbūl der Ḥāl-i Khuyūl. See Rieu, Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum (London, 1888), p. 127.

a) Introduction. Here the author speaks about his interest in the science of horsemanship and his experience of good and bad horses.

Chapter I deals with the Qur'ānic verses and the traditions (aḥadīth) on horses and their importance.

Chapter II deals with the signs of good and bad horses.

Chapter III discusses the management of horses.

Chapter IV deals with the teeth and age of horses.

In the conclusion (khātima) the author treats the properties of the various parts of the horse.

Although the subject of this work seems at first glance somewhat surprising for an author such as Qāḍī-zāde, it is almost certain that he did indeed write it.[57] By the fact that it was presented to Sulṭān 'Othmān II, it is clearly an early work. Perhaps Qāḍī-zāde wrote it to gain favour from this young Sulṭān, who was known to be keen on reforming Ottoman society and returning to the days of Süleymān the Magnificent. Thereafter, Qāḍī-zāde might have been able to impose his new ideas for reform on the young Sulṭān. This idea, however, even if it was indeed the motive for the composition of this work, was destined to

---

57. The only MS. which I have been able to find (British Museum, Add. 7901) incorporates Qāḍī-zāde's name, as the author, in the introduction.

founder because of the premature death of Sulṭān ʻOthmān II.[58]

In addition to the works discussed above, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed wrote some short Turkish risālas in which he discussed imān, islām, millet, ṣalāt and other similar topics. Few of these have specific titles, as may be seen from the following list:

a) Risāla-i Qāḍī-zāde or Kitāb-ı Qāḍī-zāde [on ṣalāt][59]
b) Risāla fī 'l-ṣalāt al-nāfila [on supererogatory prayers][60]
c) Risāla fī 'l-nawāqis al-wuḍūʻ [on ablution][61]
d) Risāla fī bayān al-īmān al-tafṣīlī [on īmān][62]
e) Risāla Qāḍī-zāde [on īmān, islām, dīn, millet][63]
f) Risāla-i Qāḍī-zāde [on nawāfil][64]

---

58. Bursalı Meḥmed Ṭāhir, like ʻAlī Emīrī, confused Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed and ʻIlmī Meḥmed Ef. (d. 1635), and wrongly attributed this work to the latter (OM, I, p. 153).
59. İstanbul University Library, no. Tyz. 1534. Many copies can be found in the Süleymaniye and in other libraries. There are two in my possession.
60. The MS. is in very poor condition: Nuruosmaniye Library, no. 4441/7/5005.
61. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Esʻad Ef. 951/14.
62. Nuruosmaniye Library, MS. 1742/3/2155.
63. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Atif Ef. 1728/1.
64. Edinburgh University Library, Turkish MSS. no. 100-119.

g) Risāla fī 'l-īmān wa 'l-ṣalāt[65]

h) Risāla-i Qāḍī-zāde [on ṣalāt][66]

i) Risāla-i Qāḍī-zāde [on dhikr-i jahr and dhikr-i khafī][67]

Ismā'īl Pasha in his H'A attributes one more work to Qāḍī-zāde, entitled, Naṣr al-aḥbāb wa'l-aṣḥāb wa qahr al-kilāb al-siyāb fī radd al-rāfiḍa wa ghayr dhālik.[68]

---

65. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Halet Ef. 827/24.

66. In my possession.

67. In my possession.

68. H'A, II, p. 277.

Qāḍī-zāde's Proposals for Reform

The particular character of the reforms urged by Qāḍī-zāde, his insistence on fundamentals rather than the adventitious, owes much to Ibn Taymiyya and Birgiwī. The former re-defined Islamic orthodoxy, while the latter was the first Ottoman müderris to speak out against religious deviations across a broad range of issues. It was this Ottoman thinker who set the example and provided the arguments for the reformers of later ages, so much so that his countryman Qāḍī-zāde, in his personal life as well as in his teachings, can almost be seen as a latter-day Birgiwī. His early teachers had been Birgiwī's pupils and when he, in turn, became a teacher, he expounded al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya to his students alongside the classical texts of Islam. His own followers elevated this book almost to the status of revealed scripture, and scholars who ventured to criticise it on points such as its use of weak traditions were savagely attacked.[69]

The notion of a secular society in which certain activities lie outside the concerns of religion is alien to Islam, for society itself is seen as no more than a means for realizing the purposes of the faith. What may today seem narrow-mindedness and bigotry in the Qāḍī-zādelis was, in fact, a sincere effort to assert this principle in a situation where evidence of corruption was visible on all sides; and if so many of the movement's adherents

---

69. Cf. below, chapter V.

lacked the intellectual qualities of its founder and were reduced to a mere reiteration of his arguments, this must in no way be taken as invalidating the correctness of their position in the light of the Islamic view of the good society. To those who held such a belief it was necessary to have a text which could be followed without question, where might be found the answer to such problems as were constantly besetting the Ottoman state; such a work was al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya.

The urge to return to the primitive purity of Islam - the religion as it was revealed by God through the Prophet Muḥammad - had always been present among Muslim peoples, who found themselves drawn into contradictory attitudes by the political divisions which had arisen amongst them ever since the caliphate of ʻAlī. Too often, it was felt that the principles of the faith were being sacrificed to practical expediency; but how to define and identify these aberrations remained a perplexing problem. It was the responsibility of every Muslim to obey the command implicit in al-amr bi-al-maʻrūf wa'l-nahy ʻan al-munkar,[70] but how to do this in the context of an unstable society was not readily apparent, each community interpreting the injunction in the light of its own concerns. Hence, there arose from time to time voices of reform, preaching a

---

70. For a full discussion of this subject see M. Ṣāliḥ, The Political Thought of Ibn Taymiyya, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh, 1980, pp. 6-16, 225-28.

return to a fundamentalist version of the religion, purified of such accretions and distortions as it was felt to have undergone; a return, in fact, to a universal conception of Islam. In this respect the movement originated by Qāḍī-zāde is not without historical precedent, and, given the wide expanse of the Ottoman state, has implicit within it this conception of universality.

The secular power held the responsibility for assuring that its government was in accordance with the Divine Law, and those defects visible in the one arose necessarily from a failure to adhere strictly to the precepts of the other. This explains the dual nature of the Qāḍī-zāde movement, and why its founder thought it so important to win the Sulṭān over to his viewpoint as a preliminary to the more deep-rooted moral change at which he ultimately aimed.

It cannot be claimed that Qāḍī-zāde offered a radical or well-organized programme of reform, but at the core of all his arguments was an insistence on a return to the basic values; and in the capacity of public preacher, he was able to inspire in the people an attitude of self-appraisal through which they might examine all other aspects of the way in which they were practising the faith.

The role of the preacher in Islamic society - and especially in the Ottoman capital in the seventeenth century - was of particular importance in that it was the most direct means of persuading the people into a certain

mode of behaviour, rather than coercing this compliance by edict. For this reason, the men chosen for this position in the great mosques were usually distinguished figures from one or other of the dervish orders, who had gained a popular reputation for holiness.[71] The official 'ulamā', who regarded themselves as a superior social class, had lost that contact with the people that would permit them to gain their confidence; they were regarded as a part of the ruling establishment - as in fact they were - and whatever they might advocate would be interpreted as coming from the secular authority.[72] The shaykhs, on the other hand, had behind them a long tradition of independence of spirit and non-conformity, and this they could employ in swaying the minds of an audience, even though, when acting as official preachers, they were in fact as much employees of the state as were the 'ulamā'.[73] Their message of resignation (qanā'at) and their exhortations to prepare for the life after death would have induced an attitude of compliance, well-suited to an administration that would offer them little in the way of a more prosperous life. In this respect, the preacher was an instrument for sublimating social discontent, and insuring against popular

---

71. See above, chapter II, p. 62

72. B. Lewis, Istanbul, pp. 151-3.

73. According to the defter in the Topkopı Palace archive, preachers in the Sulṭān's mosque used to get daily allowance from the treasury, see Wā'iẓlerin Yewmiyelerī Defteri, Topkapı Palace, no. D, 5123.

insurrection; and in this light, too, must be seen the favour such shaykhs received from the Palace.[74]

Qāḍī-zāde exploited this privileged position to go beyond what was normally the practice of the preachers; and, while he did not advocate revolution, it was the reform, rather than the acceptance, of the *status quo* that formed the theme of his homilies. His attacks upon the Ṣūfīs can be seen as a sincere attempt to stem one of the sources of the laxity that had crept into religion. Qāḍī-zāde's comments apply to the state of the Ṣūfī orders in his own time and not to Ṣūfism in general.[75]

The interrelation between the political and the religious life in an Islamic society affords a dual approach to the reformer, who may seek changes in the one by dwelling on the defects of the other. The fact that the Qāḍī-zāde movement was able to attract wide popular support must be taken as indicative of the social discontent prevalent at the time, when the common people, who can be presumed to have had only the most superficial knowledge of the religious issues being argued, were prepared to rally around anyone who gave a voice to their feeling of protest. The fact, too, that this voice was

---

74. E.g. the relationship between Murād II and Hajji Bayrām (see chapter III), Meḥmed II and Aqshams al-Dīn and Aḥmad I and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Hüdāyī.

75. Qāḍī-zāde, *Irshād al-ʿUqūl*, ff. 62-84.

speaking in the name of true Islam would have lent a justification to the spirit of revolt they felt within themselves, and a sense of rectitude to their activities.

As pointed out by Bernard Lewis, the social, political and economic problems and crises of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were responsible for the emergence of several politico-ethical tracts (lāyiḥa), in which Ottoman statesmen, scholars and intellectuals attempted to draw the attention of the rulers to a decline in the Ottoman institutions. These lāyiḥajis not only pointed out the weaknesses, but they also suggested some remedies to rectify the situation and to save the state from collapse.[76] Among such works are the Āsāfnāme of Lüṭfi Pasha (d. 1563),[77] the anonymous Kitāb-ı Müstetāb,[78] Qoči Beg's risāla[79] and some others.[80] Apart from these

---

76. B. Lewis, "Ottoman observers of Ottoman decline" in IS, I (1962), pp. 71-87; idem, "Some reflections on the decline of the Ottoman Empire" in SI, IX (1958), pp. 112-27.
77. R. Fiğlalı (ed.) Âsâfnâme (Ankara, 1977).
78. Y. Yücel (ed.), Kitāb-ı Müstetāb (Ankara, 1974).
79. Z. Danışman (ed.) Koçi Bey Risālesi (Ankara, 1972).
80. T. Gökbilgin, "XVII Asırda Osmanlı devletinde ıslahat ihtiyac ve temayülleri ve Kātip Çelebi" in Kātib Çelebi : hayatı ve eserleri (Ankara, 1957), pp. 197-218.

risālas, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed Ef. also composed one, the Tāj al-rasā'il wa minhāj al-wasā'il,[81] in which he, unlike the other authors, concentrated on the religious issues and laid special emphasis on the sharī'a and its application in the conduct of government. The other lāyiḥajis were, for the most part, very superficial in their analysis of the troubles besetting the state, looking back nostalgically to the age of Ottoman expansion and prosperity and trying to detect the differences between then and their own times. In a certain sense, their view of history was as static as that of the religious reformers, conceiving of an ideal situation in the past which could again be restored by correcting certain corruptions and deviations. For Qāḍī-zāde, however, this ideal situation was not the Ottoman heyday, but rather the Islamic purity of the period of the first four caliphs.

In addition to these risālas there are a number of qaṣīdas which deal with the same subject, describing the problems, crises and sufferings of the people and the corruption and injustice in the administration. The earliest of these is attributed to Shaykh 'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī (d. 1639). In the qaṣīda which he is said to have presented to Sulṭān Aḥmad I (d. 1617) he described the injustice, corruption, bribery and other illegal practices

---

81. See the works of Qāḍī-zāde, above, p. 154-5.

in Ottoman society.[82] A second qaṣīda was composed by the famous prose writer Waysī (d. 1628). Gibb writes on Waysī's qaṣīda as follows:

> "In this work for the first time in Turkish poetry we get an absolutely truthful picture of society as it actually was; the gloss of conventionality and lying flattery is away, and the poet tells us what he really saw, not what he desired the great men of his day to believe he was content to see."[83]

Qāḍī-zāde's qaṣīda,[84] probably written a few years later than that of Waysī, forms a third example of this genre.

It will be seen, then, that two of Qāḍī-zāde's works are concerned not only with religious but also with social or political reform. Both these works deserve particular attention, not only for the analysis they present of a deteriorating social and political situation, but also for the light they shed on the circumstances, both social and religious, that produced the Qāḍī-zāde movement itself.

In the introduction to Tāj al-rasā'il wa minhāj al-wasā'il, Qāḍī-zāde presents certain general considerations of religion and politics. He distinguishes two kinds of

---

82. See Z. Hayran (trs.) Kaza ve Kader Risālesi (Sivas, n.d.), p. 7.

83. E.J.W. Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, III (London, 1904), pp. 208-12.

84. See the works of Qāḍī-zāde, above, p. 155-6.

statesmen: prophets and kings. The former are sent by God to make known His commandments and establish justice, protecting people against unjust rulers. Kings, on the other hand, are responsible for the implementation of these Divine commandments delivered through the prophets; when they behave rightly, that is, when they strictly apply the shari'a to the conduct of affairs, their people (the umma) will be happy and prosperous; if they fall short in this, there can be no enduring contentment in society.[85]

After listing the names of the Muslim states since the time of the four Rightly Guided Caliphs, Qāḍī-zāde considers the fluctuations of Islamic history as a manifestation of the wisdom (ḥikma) of God, and cites the following verse:

> "Lo! Allah changeth not the condition of a folk until they (first) change that which is in their hearts..." (13/11)

Following the verse, Qāḍī-zāde asserts that Allah punishes unjust rulers by sending the infidels upon them.[86]

Chingiz Khān and Tīmūr were both visitations of God on people lax in their faith, the one an unbeliever and the other a tyrant.[87]

Qāḍī-zāde then comes to 'Othmān Ghāzi and the

---

85. Qāḍī-zāde, Taj al-rasā'il, fol. 4b.

86. Idem, fol. 6a.

87. Idem, op. and loc. cit.

establishment of the Ottoman state. Here he praises the early days of the state during which the rulers applied the sharīʻa, practised justice and respected the ʻulamāʼ. As a result, they were successful in their expansion. So long as they followed the Divine Law they knew only success and prosperity.[88] In the following quotation, Qāḍī-zāde expresses his view of the good old days of the Ottomans.

> "Within the Divinely protected [Ottoman] dominions, the Ottoman Sulṭāns made the propagation of what is right and the assistance of the distressed their business,[89] firm adherence to the sharīʻa their habit and justice their sign. They came to know that the continuance of religion comes about through the sharīʻa, the continuance of the sharīʻa comes about through learning (ʻilm) and the continuance of learning comes about through the ʻulamāʼ."[90]

Qāḍī-zāde goes on to say that, in the light of the maxims al-nās ʻalā dīn mulūkihim, "the people will fashion their behaviour on that of their rulers," and, al-ʻabd min ṭīnat mawla-hu, "the servant is from the same mould as his master," ministers and officers will base their behaviour on the rulers.[91] When this leads

---

88. Idem, fol. 5a.

89. The text has اتكى وكار the (و) must be a scribal error.

90. Fol. 7a.

91. Fol. 8b.

to neglect of the Divine Law, the misery which results will not be relieved until there is a change in the behaviour of the ruler.

The main part of the Tāj al-rasā'il is a translation of Ibn Taymiyya's work al-Siyāsat al-shar'iyya fī iṣlāḥ al-rā'i wa al-ra'iyya.[92] Ibn Taymiyya, it seems, prepared this work at the request of the Mamluk ruler Abū 'l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. Qalā'ūn b. 'Abd Allah al-Ṣaliḥī (684-741/1284-1340), in order to offer solutions to certain problems which his government was facing. Hence, the purpose of the work was intended to be practical rather than theoretical. It deals mainly with the rules of administration and the mutual duties of the ruler and the subjects.[93]

One might speculate about the reasons why Qāḍī-zāde chose Ibn Taymiyya's work to translate and present to the Sulṭān, rather than a better known treatise on political philosophy such as, for instance, al-Ghazālī's Naṣīḥat

---

92. The translation begins in fol. 18a.

93. U.M. Ṣāliḥ, The Political Thought of Ibn Taymiyya, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh, 1980, pp. 119-65, 181-7.
E.J. Rosenthal, Political Thought in Medieval Islam (Cambridge, 1958), pp. 11, 52, 62.

al-muluk,[94] or Niẓām al-Mulk's Siyāsatnāme.[95] One attractive feature of Ibn Taymiyya's work for Qāḍī-zāde has been Ibn Taymiyya's conception of the Islamic ruler. Because of his dread of social disorder, Ibn Taymiyya was prepared to compromise to the extent that he does not demand that the ruler himself be a man of high morality quality, so long as he governs justly in accordance with the Qur'ān and sunna.[96]

Sulṭān Murād IV is known to have been a heavy drinker. This fact must have been well known to Qāḍī-zāde, who would, of course, have had the strongest objections to this unlawful practice. However, since there was no question of removing Murād and replacing someone else on the throne, Qāḍī-zāde had no alternative but to attempt to achieve the reforms he desired through this sulṭān. In fact, Murād had many other qualities such as firmness, courage, intelligence and energy which well fitted him to carry out these tasks.[97]

---

94. This work has been translated into English by C. Darke, under the title of Counsel for Kings (London 1964).

95. This work has been translated by H. Barke, under the title, The Book of Government or Rules for Kings (London, 1978).

96. M. Ṣāliḥ, op. cit., pp.128-47.

97. C. Baysun, "Murad IV" in İA, VIII, p. 646.

In Qāḍī-zāde's view these positive qualities must have outweighed the Sulṭān's reprehensible indulgence in alcohol.

Ibn Taymiyya's al-Siyāsat al-Shar'iyya would therefore have seemed to Qāḍī-zāde to be as applicable to the conditions of the Ottoman state in his own time as it had been to that of thirteenth-century Mamluk Egypt. Even the fact that Ibn Taymiyya was of a different madhhāb (Ḥanbalī) from the Ottomans (who were Ḥanafī) did not, in Qāḍī-zāde's eyes detract from the appropriateness of translating his work.

Qāḍī-zāde's qaṣīda is also addressed to the Sulṭān, Murād IV, and deals with the various problems which had arisen in the Ottoman state and its institutions. The problems may be studied under three main groups: 1) governmental, 2) socio-economic and 3) moral.

The first group includes the responsibilities and duties of the Sulṭān, the judicial system and the army. The author's main object is in fact to remind the Sulṭān of his duties towards God and his responsibilities to his people. The author outspokenly draws the Sulṭān's attention to the situation in his dominions, and asks him to be vigilant, otherwise even the throne will be lost. He even ventures to warn him by saying that in the case of his failure to fulfil his responsibilities he will be questioned and held responsible on the Day of Judgement:

"You are the possessor of the sword of bravery
and the servant of the Sharī'a;
The Glorified One requests from you justice
for his servants; take note
The khutbe has been recited and money has
been coined in your name;
You will certainly be held responsible for
the justice due from a Sulṭān; take note."

Qāḍī-zāde not only warns the Sulṭān concerning his responsibilities, but also suggests what measures he should take. These include being watchful and well - informed about the people and their condition, and finding expert, pious officers to help him to execute his authority.

"My king, if you want to get rid of all this
injustice,
Check the people responsible for it day and
night, and be firmly vigilant; take note."

The author, like other writers of lāyihas, makes a comparison between the time of Sulṭān Murād IV and that of his predecessors,[98] when the people had enjoyed comfort and stability.

98. Although Qāḍī-zāde does not mention any of the earlier sulṭāns by name, he is presumably referring, like the other lāyiḥajis, to the sulṭāns of the "golden age", from Meḥmed II to Süleymān I.

"We had been comfortable under the good
administration of your great ancestor,
Now for a particular reason this age has
changed; take note."

The army was one of the fundamental institutions of Ottoman society, perhaps the most important one. So long as the army is strong and powerful, the state will be victorious and strong. In order to achieve this, two qualities are essential; discipline and training. When these two elements are lacking, the defeat of such an army is inevitable. The degeneration of an army may appear in various ways, either by the taking of unskilled and untrained people into its ranks or by the soldiers indulging in trade and business which will affect their training and discipline.

"The rich members of the military have become
shopkeeprs;
They certainly do not want the officially fixed
price; the measure has been tampered with;
take note."

Naturally, when the seeds of corruption creep into the institution of the Sultanate, this will affect the other institutions, such as the judiciary. Qāḍī-zāde is very much concerned with law and order and justice:

"All the affairs of the shari'a have been
corrupted by bribery;
The foreigner has become free from questions
and the fundamental principles have sunk
out of sight; take note."

"If the world remains one, two or three years
with such injustice,
The favours of the Merciful One will not come
down to earth from heaven; take note."

The worst kind of corruption was apparently bribery. This social evil is discussed in every risāla and qaṣīda concerned with reform. Qāḍī-zāde is very direct in his complaint.

"The appointment of a person to office does not
happen through the proper channels;
All the people have gathered and shown insubordination;
take note."

Qāḍī-zāde does not fail to point out the source of anarchy and rebellion. In his view, the anarchy originates from the state officials who have obtained their posts either through purchase or by other illegal means.

"It has always been from among your governors
that jalālilik has first appeared;
They have all been dismissed and left without
posts; take note."

When the social order breaks down, there is no security and stability, so people even leave their homes and move to the comparative security of remote places. Qāḍī-zāde draws attention to this phenomenon as follows:

"There is no house left in the provinces where
before there was prosperity;
They have fled to inaccessible mountains, and
the wilderness has filled up [with people],
take note."

In pointing out the moral and religious problems of Ottoman Muslim society, Qāḍī-zāde draws attention to the people whom he regards as the chief offenders.

"Wine-drinking and sodomy have spread widely
in the world;
Most of those who commit these acts are leading
figures and notables; take note."

Being a preacher, Qāḍī-zāde must have had firsthand knowledge of the people who held important religious posts such as those of preacher and qaḍī. On this occasion he does not miss his opportunity to attack these groups:

"All the mischief-makers and liars have become
preachers;
They are transmitting lies and slanders from the
pupils; take note.
The qāḍīs understand but do not practise, the
khatībs do not understand;
I am afraid the Qur'ān will rise up to the sky
one day; take note."

As we have mentioned, Qāḍī-zāde also makes some suggestions to solve these problems. These too are directed to the Sulṭān himself, who had absolute power in his hands. Qāḍī-zāde urges the Sulṭān to seek out devout, pious people, ahl-i furqān (of whom, according to the author, there are few in the whole land), and appoint them to the positions of authority.

"The acts which every one commits are going
unpunished
O Sulṭān, give the post to the person worthy of
it, without money; take note."

"There is not to be found one man in a thousand
who is both honest and pious
In every region the ehl-i furqān are extremely
few; take note."

Finally, the author states his reason for composing the qasīda, which was to seek the approval of God:

"This your humble servant has written words of
truth in order to please God
In no way does he expect high position or title
from the people; take note."

It is his stress on religion that distinguished Qāḍī-zāde from the other lāyiha writers; whereas they sought remedies for the defects which were allowing a once-splendid edifice to collapse in ad hoc adjustments to the existing order, Qāḍī-zāde's approach was fundamentally directed to the moral basis of society itself, which if not improved, would make all other attempts at reform valueless.

Other champions of reform, who drew attention only in written treatises to the corruptions which had crept into the structure of the state, could not expect to stimulate the same response among a largely illiterate population and in a society which offered no forum for public discussion.

'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī[99]

Siwāsī's Life

Al-Shaykh 'Abd al-Majīd b. Muḥarram b. Abī 'l-Barakāt Muḥammad b. 'Arif Majd al-Dīn bū 'l-Khayr al-Siwāsī, commonly known as Siwāsī Efendi, or Shaykhī, was born in 971/1563 in Zile, near Tokat, where his father, Muḥarram Ef. (d. 1000/1591),[100] was shaykh of the Khalwatī dervish order. Unfortunately, no more information is available about his origins.

Having come from a learned family, 'Abd al-Majīd had his early education at home from his father. According to 'Ushāqī-zāde and Naẓmī Meḥmed, he was able to read the Qur'ān at a very early age, completing the memorization of the whole work by the time he was seven. Having reached the age of puberty, he began the study of Arabic grammar under his father, showing remarkable ability and talent. He continued his studies under the supervision of his uncle, the famous Khalwatī Shaykh Shams al-Dīn Siwāsī (d. 1006/1597),[101]

---

99. The sources of biographical information on 'Abd al-Majīd Ef. are:
    Naẓmī Meḥmed, Hadiyyat al-Ikhwān, İstanbul University Library MS. Ty. no. 1124 (Fols. 45a-58a); 'Ushāqī-zāde, pp. 49-55; Ismā'īl Pasha, H'A, I, p. 620; OM, I, 120; SO, III, p. 400; Kātib Čelebi, Mīzān, p. 107; 'O.R. Kahhāla, Mu'jam al-Muallifīn, (Beirut, n.d.) VI, p. 170.
100. OM, II, p. 21.
101. Ibid., I, p. 95.

from whom he received instruction in *fiqh*, *tafsīr* and *ḥadīth*. When he had obtained his certificates of competence (*ijāzatnāma*) in these subjects, and with the permission of his uncle, he began to lecture on the *Kashshāf*.[102]

When Shams al-Dīn was convinced that ʿAbd al-Majīd had gained the required knowledge concerning the *Sharīʿa*, he advised him to apply himself to the *ʿIlm al-bāṭin*. ʿAbd al-Majīd had therefore to enter a *ṭarīqa*, because it was necessary for anyone who desired to be a perfect guide (*mürshīd*) first to study the *Qur'ān* and *sunna* and then to enter a *ṭarīqa* where he would strive for spiritual perfection through the study of the *ʿIlm al-bāṭin*. Through the influence of his uncle and master he became his *mürīd* in the Khalwatī order.

It is possible to establish a *terminus post quem* for ʿAbd al-Majīd's affiliation with the *ṭarīqa*. According to Naẓmī, he was over thirty when he came to know with certainty that he had the capacity to undertake esoteric studies under his uncle's supervision. This places the event after 1001/1591.[103] Naẓmī narrates also a story

---

102. The famous *Qur'ān* interpretation of Abū 'l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar al-Zamakhsharī (1075-1144).

103. Naẓmī, *op. cit.*, fol. 46a. ʿUshāqī-zāde, however, omits Siwāsī's age in his account (*op. cit.*, pp. 49-50).

revealing ʿAbd al-Majīd's interest in this tarīqa and his being attracted to some of its practices, such as dawarān and samāʿ.[104] He applied himself wholeheartedly to the Ṣūfī way of life and the study of the esoteric sciences, so that in a short time he was the khalīfa to Shams al-Dīn Siwāsī.

ʿAbd al-Majīd subsequently became the shaykh of the Siwās of the tarīqa succeeding Rajab Ef. (Rajab b. Shaykh Ibrāhīm Jamāl al-Dīn Siwāsī),[105] at which time he moved to Siwās, where he settled in the tekke called Shamsī Khānqāh. Through his discourses and teachings, his fame spread all over Anatolia and even reached the ears of Sulṭān Meḥmed III (reigned 1595-1603), who had taken Shams al-Dīn Siwāsī with him on the Egrī campaign in 1005/1596.[106] The Sulṭān sent a fermān to ʿAbd al-Majīd in which he expressed his admiration for his uncle Shams al-Dīn and asked ʿAbd al-Majīd to come to Istanbul. (The sources do not give any date for this fermān.[107]) In accordance with the Qur'ānic verse, "O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the messenger and those of you who are in authority..."(5/59), ʿAbd al-Majīd set out for Istanbul.

---

104. Naẓmī, op and loc. cit.

105. OM, I, p. 75.

106. M. Gökbilgin, "Egrī Seferi" in IA, IV, pp. 196-8.

107. The full text of the fermān can be found in Naẓmī, fol. 47 ; ʿUshāqī-zāde, 51; and Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, part I, p. 357.

On his arrival in the capital, Shaykh ʻAbd al-Majīd stayed for a while in a place close to the Ayasofya Mosque, where a few days later he was requested by Sulṭān Meḥmed III to deliver a sermon which was attended by the Sulṭān himself, the Shaykh al-Islām, the high-ranking ʻulamā' and officials and a very large congregation from amongst the people. ʻAbd al-Majīd remained attached to the Ayasofya until he was given the Meḥmed Ef. zāwiye (tekke) which had been built in 993/1585.[108] He succeeded Vishne Shaykh Meḥmed Ef. (d. 1010/1601) as the third shaykh in this zāwiye.[109] While he was occupying this position, the Shaykh al-Islām of the time, Ṣunʻ Ullāh Ef. (d. 1021/1612),[110] who held him in respect and admiration, requested that he deliver the Friday sermons (waʻz) in his mosque (Ṣunʻ Ullāh Masjid).[111] After a few months he was offered the same position in the Sheh-zāde Mosque, and in order that he might retain the two, he changed the day of his sermon in

---

108. M.S.B. İsmāʻīl, İstanbuldaki Tekkelerin Tārīkhleri ve Bānīleri, İstanbul, Belediye Library, MS. no. K. 75, fol 22b; ʻUshaqī-zāde, 51; İ. Aywansarayi, Ḥadīqat al-Jawāmiʻ (İstanbul, 1281), I, pp. 197-9.

109. İsmāʻil, op. cit. fol. 22b.

110. Danişmend, Kronoloji, V, p. 121.

111. ʻUshāqī-zāde, p. 51.

the masjid from Friday to Saturday.[112] After three years in the Mehmed Ef. zāwiye, he was given the Shaykh Yawṣī tekke (otherwise known as the Siwāsī tekke).[113]

After preaching two years in the Sheh-zāde Mosque, 'Abd al-Majīd Ef. was transferred to the Sulṭān Selīm Mosque,[114] where he remained until the Sulṭān Aḥmad Mosque was completed in 1026/1617.[115] 'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī and another famous shaykh of the age, 'Azīz Maḥmūd Hüdāyī Ef. (d. 1032/1628), were present at the opening ceremony of the mosque.[116] 'Abd al-Majīd Ef. was appointed its Friday wā'iẓ and Maḥmūd Ef. was appointed for Monday.[117] Thereupon 'Abd al-Majīd Ef., at the request of Sulṭān Aḥmad I (reigned 1603-17), left the Sulṭān Selīm Mosque for the Sulṭān Aḥmad, where he remained until his death in Jam. II 1049/September 1639.[118] His funeral prayers were conducted by his son-in-law and successor, Shaykh 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī Ef. (d. 1650), and he

---

112. Naẓmī, op. cit., fol. 47b.

113. Aywansarayi, op. cit., I, pp. 121-2.

114. Naẓmī, fol. 47b.

115. Aywansarayi, Ḥadīqat al-Jawami', I, pp. 18-19.

116. F.N. Tansel, "Seyyid 'Aziz Maḥmūd Hudayī" in İFD, XV (1967), pp. 1-42.

117. Naẓmī, p. 489. İ. Anqarawī, Silsile-i Ṭarīqi Jalwatiyya, (İstanbul, 1291), p. 39.

118. Ushaqī-zāde, p. 51.

was buried near the Nishānji Jāmi' in Eyyūb.[119]

Two chronograms are given for his death:

120 بیك قرق طقوزده آلدی اجعفده مكان

121 غم ایتمشكی عقلی چاك تاریخنی دیدی بو خاك
بیك قرق طقوزده الدی پاك سیواسی اوجعفده مكان

The Works of Siwāsī

The works and achievements of 'Abd al-Majīd Ef. reflect his character and personality to such a degree that the one cannot be fully understood apart from the other. Even though personal information is only scantily given in the sources, one may still glean therefrom some insights into the quality of this distinguished religious figure of the seventeenth century. The fact that he was able to gain respect in every level of society, both as a dervish shaykh and a popular preacher, must be attributed to his ability to communicate his wide learning in a form capable of being understood by all who hear him, and this in turn could only have arisen from an awareness of the nature of his audiences and their spiritual concerns. Though a scholar of wide reputation and an implacable

---

119. 'Ushaqī-zāde, op. cit., pp. 51-2.

120. OM, I, p. 120.

121. 'Ushaqī-zāde, op. and loc. cit.

polemicist, he realized that the ultimate purpose of all this learning and disputation was to make the truths of religion, as he saw them, accessible to the people, and consequently he did not, as so many of his contemporaries did, regard his education as a personal distinction which set him apart from other men.

The author of over twenty works, mainly in Turkish, on the Sharīʻa and taṣawwuf, ʻAbd al-Majīd was also a poet, employing the makhlaṣ "shaykhī",[122] and his dīwān still survives. A large number of works are attributed to ʻAbd al-Majīd Siwāsī. Five of these (nos. 1-5 in the list below) will be described in some detail because of their relevance to the controversy between Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī.

1. Durar al-ʻaqāʼid wa ghurar kull sāʼiq wa qāʼid.[123]
2. Kitāb biḍā ʻat al-wāʻiẓīn.[124]
3. Durrat al-ʻaqāʼid.[125]
4. Ḥaḍarāt khamsa.[126]

---

122. OM, I, p. 120; Mizān, p. 107.
123. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Lāteli, 2408/1.
Millet Library, MS. ʻAli Emirī Şerʻiyye, 281. The author's own copy.
124. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Kılıçalı Paşa, 1032-2.
125. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mihrişah Sultan, 300/1.
126. Süleymaniye Library, MS, Mihrişah Sultan, 300/5.

5. Risālat al-qaḍa wa'l-qadar.[127]

6. Tafsīri sūre-i Fātiḥa.[128]

7. Diwān-ı Shaykhī.[129]

8. Luqhat-ı Mathnawī Sharīf.[130]

9. Mi'yār al-ṭarīq.[131]

10. Sharḥ-i ghazal-ı mīmiyye li-mawlanā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī.[132]

11. Tarjuma-ı risāla-i Shaykh al-akbār.[133] [134]

---

127. Translated from Arabic into Turkish by Z. Hayran, see below.

128. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mihrişah Sultan, 300/2.

129. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Lala İsmail Ef. 453/1 .

130. Süleymaniye Library, MS, Mustafa Aşir Ef. 385.

131. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mihrişah Sultan, 300/3.

132. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mihrişah Sultan, 300/4.

133. Süleymaniye Library, MS. Fatih, 5385/7.

134. All of the above works are listed in H'A, p. 602; OM, I, p. 120; 'Ushaqī-zāde, p. 52 and Hadiyyat al-Ikhwān, fol. 48. These sources also mention a number of other works of which I have not been able to trace any manuscripts.

1. <u>Durar al-'aqā'id wa ghurar kull sā'iq wa qā'id.</u>[135]

This work, which is in Turkish, was completed in 1024/1615. In it Siwāsī deals with such matters as <u>īmān</u>, <u>islām</u> and <u>farḍ</u>, basing his views on those of Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī (d. 333/944)[136] and Abū 'l-Ḥasan al-'Ash'arī (d. 324/935).[137] In addition, he discusses certain terms of Ṣūfism such as <u>karāmāt</u>, <u>mu'jizāt</u> and <u>istidrāj</u>.

Siwāsī explains his purpose in composing this work at the beginning. He says that in his own time, when corruption and immorality are widespread, the laymen choose what they want. They are therefore inclined to follow irreligious people or atheists who deceive the common man through their attractive language. Therefore, in order to demonstrate the truth (<u>ḥaqq</u>) and destroy falsehood (<u>bāṭil</u>), this book is compiled in Turkish for the common benefit, from books of <u>tafsīr</u>, <u>fatāwā</u> and theology.[138]

The book is divided into sixty <u>maṭlab</u>, under which the author collects and discusses the views of the two

---

135. 'Ali Emīrī, Şeriyye, 281. This is the author's own copy.

136. D.B. Macdonald, "Māturīdi" in <u>EI</u>[1], III, pp. 414-15.

137. W. Montgomery Watt, "al-Ash'arī, Abu 'l-Ḥasan" in <u>EI</u>[2], I, pp. 694-5.

138. <u>Durar</u>, fol. 5.

aforementioned imāms, along with Qur'ānic verses and traditions (hadīth) relevant to each subject. In addition, he narrates some stories about the early Ṣūfīs to support his ideas. In fact, his approach is, as might be expected, typical of a man from a Ṣūfī background. However, he does not fail to consult Islamic theological books of such classical status as Mawāqif, Maqāṣid,[139] Milāl,[140] Sharḥ 'aqā'id Taftazānī,[141] Fiqh Akbar.[142]

Although the Durar has the appearance of a compilation, the author does also express his own views on some issues which were the causes of dispute between himself and Qāḍī-zāde, like al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar and du'ā' li 'l-amwāt (prayers to/for the dead). The work will be referred to often in chapter VIII, in discussion of the problems disputed between Siwāsī and Qāḍī-zāde, but the breadth of its range may be indicated here by mentioning just a few of the subjects which it covers: the mi'rāj, intercession (shafā'a), the children of polytheists (mushrikīn), the descent of Jesus.

---

139. A work of Sa'd al-Dīn Mas'ūd b. 'Umar al-Taftazānī (1322-89) a manual of kalām.

140. A work of Abū Bakr Ahmād b. 'Ali b. Khātib al-Baghdādī (d. 1071), see GAL, I, pp. 400, 428.

141. Taftazānī's commentary on the al-Nasafī's work on the creed of Islam, see E.E. Elder, A Commentary on the Creed of Islam (New York, 1950).

142. A work of Abū Ḥanīfa, see A.J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed (London, 1979).

2. <u>Kitāb bidā 'at al-wā'iẓīn.</u>

Originally written in Arabic, this work was translated into Turkish by the author himself. Its date of completion is not known. The work is a rare example of homilies in Turkish, in which the author describes the qualities desirable in a preacher, on the basis of his experiences. He does not miss the opportunity to criticize certain unnamed preachers of his own time, whose mode of life was in contradiction to their sermons.

The book is divided into fifty <u>maṭlab</u>, in each of which the author usually cites Qur'ānic verses and traditions in support of his views. In addition, he quotes from the Companions of the Prophet and certain early Ṣūfīs. Being a man of the <u>ṭarīqat</u>, his views reflect a Ṣūfī position, and insistence on moral values is very obvious.

The work begins with the Qur'ānic verse, "Call unto the way of thy Lord with wisdom and fair exhortation, and reason with them in the better way..." (16/125). After this, Siwāsī describes the Prophet's qualities and attributes, both as a human being and as a preacher of Islam, presenting him as the best example for every Muslim to follow. Next, he deals with wisdom (<u>ḥikma</u>) and its divisions. This is followed by other topics, such as <u>akhlāq ḥasana</u>, <u>ṣabr wa istighfār</u>, <u>tawāḍḍu</u>, <u>falāḥ</u>, <u>al-dawarān li 'l-Ṣūfiyya</u> and <u>'alāmāt ahl Allāh</u>.

3. Durrat al-ʻaqāʼid.

This work, written in Turkish, mentions no date of completion. It deals with three important issues in Islam, īmān, iʻtiqād and ʻibāda..[143] It is very likely that the book was prepared to serve as a guide for the common people generally, and new converts to a ṭarīqa in particular, in order to show them the way to conduct their daily life in accordance with the Qurʼān and sunna, and with the practices of the Companions of the Prophet and certain early Ṣūfīs.

As in most of his other works, Siwāsī arranged this book under maṭlabs, in which he summarises very concisely the life pattern of the Ṣūfī and its principles. The work begins with a discussion of the responsibilities of man as the choicest of God's creation on earth, the author finding in the sunna of the Prophet the perfect model for this fulfilment. The Qurʼānic verse, "Say, (O Muḥammad, to mankind) If ye love Allah, follow me; Allah will love you and forgive your sins. Allah is forgiving and merciful" (3/31) is quoted in support of this prescription.

In another maṭlab [144] the mürīd is urged to read the

---

143. See A.S. Levend, "Divan Edebiyatımızın Başlıca Ürünleri", in Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllıgı Belleten (1972), p. 25.

144. Durrat al-ʻaqāid, fol. 17b.

inspiring literature of the Ṣūfī masters, such as the Tadhkirat al-awliyā',[145] the Asrārname[146] and the Mathnawī.[147] Other chapters deal with Ṣūfī concepts such as dhikr, baqā' and ṭarīqa, mainly on the basis of orthodox interpretations. The reader gains the strong impression that Siwāsī was influenced by Muḥyi 'l-Dīn ibn al-'Arabī

4. Ḥaḍarāt khamsa.

This work is written in Turkish and mentions no date of completion. It deals clearly and succinctly with five important issues of taṣawwuf. These are:

a) 'Ālam-ı ghayb-ı muṭlaq
b) 'Ālam-ı arwāḥ
c) Khiyāl [wa] muṭlaq
d) 'Ālam-ı mulk wa shahāda
e) Insān-ı kāmil.

145, 146. Tadhkirat al-Awliyā' and Asrārname are works by Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār (d. 1220 or 1230); see A.J. Arberry, Muslim Saints and Mystics (London, 1979), p. 1.

147. The famous work of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273), edited and translated by R.A. Nicolson, The Mathnawī of Jalāl u'd-Dīn Rūmī, 6 vols (London, 1925-1940).

5. <u>Risālat al-qaḍā' wa'l-qadar.</u>[148]

This was written in Arabic, and the only known manuscript was apparently copied in 1050/1640 by 'Umar b. al-Ḥajj Ilyās al-Siwāsī. The author deals briefly with two important theological concepts over which there had been dispute for centuries, <u>qaḍā'</u> and <u>qadar</u>. After the introduction and a brief account of <u>tawḥīd</u>, the author defines these two issues according to the standard theological works, dwelling on certain points of detail, and finally touches upon briefly the <u>madhhabs</u>, which he regards as being four in number.

a) <u>Qadariyya</u>

b) <u>Jabriyya</u>

c) <u>Mu'tazila</u>

d) <u>Ahl al-Sunna</u>

---

148. Z. Hayran (trans.) <u>Kaza ve Kader Risalesi</u> (Sivas, n.d.). This modern Turkish translation appeared in 1976. No location is given for the manuscript upon which it is based. The work was previously unknown, and I have not come across any manuscripts myself.

The Dispute between Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī

In the history of Na'īmā, the movement inaugurated by Qāḍī-zāde is presented as but another phase in the unending dispute between the representatives of the medrese and the Ṣūfīs, the one representing established orthodoxy and the other popular religion. Under the events of the year 1066/1656, many years after the death of both Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī, the author deals with the bitter conflict into which their argument had developed, introducing his narrative with a brief general survey of the controversy between these two groups throughout Islamic history:

> "Let it be known that the dispute and quarrel between the members of the dervish orders who follow the Ṣūfī path and the orthodox 'ulamā' ('ulamā'-ı ẓāhir)[149] is very ancient. It is recorded in the history books that since the time of the first Caliphs, in the state preceding [ours] and in Baghdād, Cairo and other cities, their controversies and disputes have on many occasions reached a level conducive to war and bloodshed. Those who investigated the implications of the claims of these two groups raised them to [the level of] a verbal dispute, and reconciled their statements [with one another]. However, a permanent resolution has never been reached, and in every age certain people, in order to gain fame and reputation, have appeared under the pretext of

---

149. Those who concern themselves with the outward meaning of the texts.

> 'al-amr [bi'l] ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar' taken up various issues and well-known innovations and stirred up the old quarrels again. Finally, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed Efendi emerged, from amongst the shaykhs of Rūm; because of the difference of temperament between him and Siwāsī Efendi one of the Ṣūfī shaykhs, [the two of them] they opposed each other and laid out the premises of dispute and strife in order to renew the ancient quarrel."[150]

To some extent Na'īmā is right in his presentation of the dispute between Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī as a continuation of the endless disagreement between the representatives of the medrese and the tekke. On the other hand, to present the controversy exclusively as the rivalry of two shaykhs wishing to gain fame and recognition would be to underestimate its value and importance from a social and religious viewpoint, when one considers the aims and objectives of the dispute, the importance of the participants and finally its consequences for seventeenth-century Ottoman society.

The movement may actually be viewed from two main aspects, which are difficult to separate clearly. The first aspect, as expressed by Na'īmā and Kātib Čelebi,[151] who were contemporaries of the movement, is that it was a revival of the historical disagreement between the members of the 'ilmiyye and the Ṣūfīs, which manifested itself in

---

150. Na'īmā, VI, p. 218.

151. Kātib Čelebi, Balance, pp. 132-4.

the form of a competition between two leading preachers of the age for fame and recognition. The second aspect of the movement, which was not seen by the above-mentioned two authors, was that it was an <u>iṣlāḥ</u> (reform) movement motivated by religious duty and inspired by previous <u>'ulamā'</u> such as Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Taymiyya and Meḥmed Birgīwī.[152] The interpretation of the Qāḍī-zāde movement as an <u>iṣlāḥ</u> movement is well justified when one takes into consideration the motives behind the movement, the aims and objectives of its adherents[153] and, most importantly, Qāḍī-zāde's own concern with the political corruption and socio-economic problems of Ottoman society in his time, as reflected in his <u>qaṣīda</u>. The scanty information provided by the sources does not allow us to assume that he dealt in his sermons with the issues raised in the <u>qaṣīda</u>. To speak about such inflammatory

---

152. It is possible to observe a pattern in the emergence of religious reform movements in the Islamic world. They have tended to occur at periods of political discontent and social and economic crisis. See D. Hopwood, "A pattern of revival movements in Islam?" in <u>IQ</u>, 15 (1971), pp. 149-158.

153. Perhaps the clearest statement of the aims of the movement is to be found in the demands made of Meḥmed IV in 1656. See chapter V, below.

matters as injustice and bribery from the pulpit would probably have been tantamount to committing political suicide.

If the movement, as suggested by Na'īmā and Kātib Čelebi, had been only a rivalry between two shaykhs, it would not have continued beyond the lifetime of the two men involved;[154] nor would it have penetrated outside the religious classes to include other groups in society.[155] Moreover, it would not have encouraged a certain group of people to resort to violence in order to convince their opponents. Finally, during a period of social crises, religious laxity and widespread immorality one would not imagine two distinguished and well-established preachers attacking each other on very trivial issues in order to attain fame and reputation. They were already well-known and recognized enough.

Generally speaking, the members of the medreses, as a class, were regarded as the custodians of orthodoxy, serving also the interests of secular authority by ensuring a conformity of belief and practice in the population. Their education placed them apart from the illiterate masses and entitled them to a degree of respect which they jealously guarded, resenting any encroachments thereon by rivals from outside their class. This led them

---

154. Cf. the dispute between Abu 'l-Su'ūd and Birgīwī; See Balance, chapter XX, pp. 128-131.

155. See below, pp. 211-12.

to adopt a rigidly conservative attitude to matters affecting religion, for the maintenance of their own authority in society depended on the unchallengeable integrity of the religion they existed to protect.

The Ṣūfīs, on the other hand, expressed an individual rather than a social concept of the religious life, seeing spiritual development in personal activity rather than in conforming to prescribed forms. They directed their main effort to the spiritual development of the individual, paying more attention to ma'rifa than to 'ilm.[156] As their attitude towards religious matters was generally tolerant and flexible, their main concern being man's inner purity rather than his outward observances, it was natural that they should allow the introduction of new beliefs and uncanonical practices into the Muslim community, practices and beliefs which were not based on the teachings of the Qur'ān and sunna. For this reason, many members of the medrese viewed the Ṣūfīs with suspicion and criticised their beliefs and practices.[157] And yet it was not

156. For more discussion on this question see F. Rahman, Islam (Chicago, 1979), pp. 128-373; Arberry, Sufism (London, 1950), pp. 74-83; H.A.R. Gibb, Islam[3] (Oxford, 1973), p. 93; Qushayrī, Risāla (Cairo, 1340), pp. 140-3; F. Rosenthal, Knowledge Triumphant (Leiden, 1970), pp. 35-40.

157. E.g. in the sixteenth century, Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī, Čiwi-zāde, Ibn Kemāl and Abu 'l-Su'ūd.

uncommon for members of the 'ulamā' to associate themselves with one of the ṭarīqas, finding therein the spirituality which was lacking in the formal teaching of the medrese in which they had been trained. Government officials, too, were to be found in the orders, and it was due to their influence that shaykhs were accorded ceremonial privileges alongside the 'ulamā'. It would be wrong, therefore, to assume that the hostility between the two institutions was implacable and inevitable. When friction did develop between them there were usually external factors leading to a confrontation.

It is no accident that the public polemic in the seventeenth century should centre on such apparently trivial matters as the case of coffee and tobacco; for these were visible symbols of innovations in the community, capable of affecting some of its members and, to some extent, encouraging a spirit of indifference to traditional practices and usages. The Ṣūfīs, with their known willingness to accept innovations, appeared as the champions of change; and whether or not they all drank coffee and smoked tobacco, it can be assumed that, in any case, they would have had no objections to these "vices".

Qāḍī-zāde, as we have seen above, was himself a religious instructor who intended to provide solutions to the problems of his society, in accordance with his own religious point of view, and could only hope to achieve this by using the means available to him as a preacher. On the other hand Siwāsī, as might be expected, was

attempting to defend and protect the tariqas, some of their practices and their members from the attacks and abuse which were directed at him personally by virtue of his esteemed position among the Ṣūfīs of Istanbul.[158]

In order to bring about changes in seventeenth-century Ottoman society and government, Qāḍī-zāde required a knowledge of contemporary political realities and some access to those who held the reins of power. He also felt the need for a basis of support among the common people. It must have been apparent to Qāḍī-zāde, that, in the Ottoman state, any direct attempt to change the structure of society and the system of government would inevitably be crushed by the state.[159] He therefore had two possible approaches open to him, in order to achieve his aim and introduce the necessary changes. The first was to make his ideas known to the common people and to win their support in his struggle. A second way was to try to convince the ruler of the necessity of implementing changes. This latter course of action naturally necessitated the establishment of a good relationship with the Sulṭān and his government. This promised to be the more effective way. In fact, Qāḍī-zāde chose to act in both these directions at the same time.

As will be shown later, the issues which were under

---

158. Balance, p. 132.

159. Such a fate had befallen movements like those of Shaykh Badr al-Dīn and the Jalālīs.

discussion, however unimportant they may initially have seemed to the common people, were of great moment to those who appreciated their connection with Islamic law and theology. Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī could, like their predecessors, have propagated their arguments exclusively through their risālas or books, without involving the common people. But Qāḍī-zāde chose not to submerge his ideas in works of scholarship, for he saw himself as a man with a mission, which could be best realized by a direct appeal to the masses. In the cause against the Ṣūfīs, Qāḍī-zāde also had the advantage over his predecessors, Ibn Taymiyya and Birgiwī, in that he could observe the shortcomings of their strategy. While they had chosen to continue their strife through intellectual debate among the educated élite, and consequently failed to attract much support, Qāḍī-zāde realized that a popular following would offer a greater possibility of success. Qāḍī-zāde eagerly grasped this opportunity, and, using his position as a preacher, gathered around him a group of zealots who eagerly took up his call for the extirpation of all innovations (bidʿa) and uncanonical practices.

Qāḍī-zāde was able to identify the Ṣūfī orders as the group in society to whom the major portion of the blame for laxity in religious practices could be attributed. It is quite reasonable to speculate that he made the Ṣūfīs scapegoats, not only for the decline in religious standards but also for the socio-economic and political evils from which the people were suffering. This would, of course,

greatly strengthen the aspect of his message to the populace at large. Through his sermons, therefore, he launched a campaign against the Ṣūfīs in general and the Mawlawīs, the Khalwatīs and the Bektāshīs[160] in particular, and seized every opportunity to make them an object of attacks and insult.

The very fact that Qāḍī-zāde addressed himself to the common people as well as to his peers was in itself enough to cause disgust in this exclusive social group, as the tone in which he argued and the language of abuse to which he stooped were, no doubt, offensive to the courtesies of debate to which it was accustomed. In his recurrent attacks on the Ṣūfīs, Kātib Čelebi tells us, Qāḍī-zāde "resuscitated the ancient objection to dancing and gyrating and won the enmity of the entire Khalwati and Mawlawī orders as well as of the cemetery caretakers. Every single one of his sermons contained some jibe or sneer, like 'O you holy ones who kick the floor-boards and blow the whistle; come Toqlu Dede, come Boqlu Dede.'"[161]

As far as the subject-matter of the controversy is concerned, it seems to follow the pattern of the classical disagreement between the Ṣūfīs and the fuqahā'. In this sense, the effort which was made by Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī was a "renewal" of the old quarrel on certain specific issues which constituted the heart of the whole controversy

160. Balance, p. 136; Rycaut, op. cit., p. 149.

161. Balance, pp. 136-7.

during their lifetime. These issues are the following:

a) Raqṣ/dawarān

b) The faith of the parents of the Prophet

c) Invoking blessings on the prophets and Companions

d) The supererogatory prayers on the nights of Raghā'ib, Barāt and 15 Sha'bān.[162]

When Qāḍī-zāde launched his attacks on the Ṣūfīs, his concentration on certain Ṣūfī orders, such as the Mawlawīs or Khalwatīs, did not only spring from his hostility towards their beliefs or practices, such as raqṣ, dawarān and music. Another consideration would certainly have been that these orders represented particular sectional interests in society. The Mawlawīs represented a cultural élite who were responsible for much of the Ottoman cultural effort in that they comprised musicians and poets, mystics and thinkers. The Khalwatīs were connected at this period with the ruling élite as is pointed out by Kissling:

> "It cannot possibly be an accident that important key positions of that period were occupied by relatives of Ḥalvetiyya sheikhs or at least by Ḥalvetiyya sympathizers."[163]

The Bektāshīs, as is well-known, were connected with the Janissaries. In attacking these groups, Qāḍī-zāde was able to mobilize the resentment of the lower orders of society

162. Balance, p. 136; Fadhlaka, II, p. 183.

163. Kissling, Role, p. 31.

against their cultural and political superiors. Thus, by using the pulpit as a platform to attack the Ṣūfīs, Qāḍī-zāde avoided a direct confrontation with the government, and yet was able to build up a following while criticising, albeit indirectly, elements which represented the political and cultural establishment.[164]

As well as his approaches towards the common people, as we have seen previously,[165] Qāḍī-zāde was careful to establish a good relationship with the Sulṭān, to whom he presented his translation of Ibn Taymiyya's work al-Siyāsat al-Sharī'a and also his qaṣīda, in which he identified the establishment as the source of public corruption. Moreover, in his qaṣīda, he looked at the problem in three ways: he identified immoral practices, attributed them to a group in society, and at the same time offered a solution in the acceptance of fundamentalist morality.

Qāḍī-zāde succeeded in winning the support of the Sulṭān for some of his ideas of reform. How this was achieved and at what point they recognized a common aim is not known, but one can identify certain shared points of interest. Qāḍī-zāde saw the necessity of sweeping reforms in the established bureaucracy, in both the civil and the religious administration. This he would achieve by abolishing what he considered innovations, among which

---

164. See Qāḍī-zāde's Qasida, pp. 125-27, above.

165. See above, pp. 150-2

were included tobacco and coffee. The Sulṭān, on the other hand, seemed to recognize the evil of the coffee-houses, wherein were consumed both of these innovations. Certainly he was not so much concerned with the innovatory nature of these stimulants as with the social ambience in which they were consumed. The coffee-houses presented a meeting-place for the people and were potential forums for discussion and the exchange of ideas.[166] As such, they could be the fermenting-pot of discontent and a possible threat to the Sulṭān's position. Murād IV therefore closed them down, and in this act we may observe a point of common interest with Qāḍī-zāde. One may, therefore, suggest that it may have been this that brought them together. In this connection, Na'īmā gives the following account:

> "His Majesty Sulṭān Murād Khān had demolished the coffee-houses in order to control and instruct the people, and issued a strict prohibition, for the purpose of preventing the consumption of tobacco and removing its existence entirely. He threatened those who were careless with violent punishment and death. At about that time Qāḍī-zāde Ef., in order to obtain recognition from the exalted sovereign, expounded the matter of the illegality of tobacco, according to his own false opinion, using independent reasoning and rational and traditional proofs. He raised his voice to the vault of heaven, uttering immeasurable fallacies."[167]

---

166. Arendonk, "Ḳahwa", in EI², V, pp. 451-2.

167. Na'īmā, VI, pp. 219-20.

Thus we see Sulṭān Murād deriving some religious sanction for particularly motivated actions, and Qāḍī-zāde receiving in exchange the support of the Sulṭān and immunity from attacks on his person. However, it was not merely the question of coffee-drinking and smoking that brought Qāḍī-zāde and the Sulṭān together. The Sulṭān had good reason to be fearful of the ṭarīqas, which represented many establishment values and therefore would resist any changes imposed from above. Hence Qāḍī-zāde's struggle against the Ṣūfīs could be exploited by the Sulṭān, who was, however, also aware of the danger of Qāḍī-zāde's popular movement. He could, and indeed there is much evidence that he did, play off these two parties, by supporting each on various occasions. Sometimes Qāḍī-zāde would receive the favour of the Sulṭān's approval, and on other occasions this would be bestowed on Siwāsī.[168] Thus the Sulṭān hoped to keep both groups in check ensuring that neither acquired complete ascendancy over the other.

On the other hand, the Ṣūfīs, in order to defend and protect their practices and beliefs from abuse and attack naturally felt the necessity and importance of taking a stand against Qāḍī-zāde and his followers. They too used the pulpit as a platform where they would apply a similar method, which was merely to expose their ideas and beliefs through their sermons under the leadership of Siwāsī Efendi. Siwāsī, because of his position as a leader of

---

168. Na'īmā, VI, pp. 219-20.

the Khalwatīs and, at the same time, a shaykh much revered by all the Ṣūfīs in the capital, took the responsibility of defending Ṣūfī practices and beliefs against their opponents.

Since Qāḍī-zāde began his attacks on the Ṣūfīs from the mosque, and since both sides in the controversy were preachers, the mosque soon became the forum for arguments and mutual abuse. Siwāsī and Ismāʿīl Dede (d. 1630) in turn abused Qāḍī-zāde and accused him of being a heretic and infidel on the basis of his denial of the Ṣūfīs and saints.[169] On at least two occasions, the proponents of the two opposing views were brought face to face, by command of the Sulṭān, and invited to argue their cases before him.

On one of these occasions (12 Rabīʿ I 1043/18 August 1633), a debate on the celebration of the Prophet's birthday took place in the Sulṭān Aḥmed Mosque, in the presence of the Sulṭān, the official ʿulamāʾ, high state official and the common people. The first to address the congregation was Siwāsī, who in a very successful and eloquent sermon attacked Qāḍī-zāde and won the heart of the audience. He then was followed by Qāḍī-zāde, who started his sermon with an interpretation of the verse: "Lo! Allah commandeth you that ye restore deposits to their owners, and, if ye judge between mankind, that, ye judge justly. Lo! comely is this which Allah admonisheth

---

169. Balance, p. 137.

you. Lo! Allah is ever Hearer, Seer." (4/58). He then stressed the duty to enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong. His eloquence and his skilful persuasion won the heart of the Sulṭān and congregation. Finally, Qāḍī-zāde completed his sermon by narrating a story from the famous sage of Turkish folklore, Naṣr al-Dīn Khwāja:

One day, when the Khawaja was ploughing his field with two oxen, one old, the other young, he took to beating the older ox when it was obvious that the younger was not pulling its weight. When asked by passers-by the reason for this seemingly perverse behaviour, he replied, "The young one will not move unless the old one does."[170]

Presumably the point of the story is that the health and well-being of society are the responsibility of its leaders, who are expected to set a good example. While the Sulṭān seemed to favour Qāḍī-zāde on this occasion, the officials and the <u>'ulamā'</u> expressed their disapproval of him.

Ergin narrates another dispute which took place between Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī, before the Sulṭān, at which the Qāḍī-'asker and the <u>Shaykh al-Islām</u> were also present in order to adjudicate between the two sides. What follows is a translation of the text as presented by Ergin.[171]

---

170. Na'īmā, III, p. 164.

171. <u>Maarif Tarihi</u>, i, pp. 199-200. Ergin was unable to give the location of the MS., apparently a <u>majmū'a</u>, from which he had taken this story. Its author is unknown.

Sulṭān Murād asked Siwāsī whether things (ashyā') praise Allāh through words (qāl) or through their state of being (ḥāl).

Siwāsī replied: "It is through words, praise be to God; some of our dervishes have heard it."

Sulṭān Murād then sent for Qāḍī-zāde and said: "Qāḍī-zāde, I asked Siwāsī about the manner in which things praise Allāh. He said 'It is through words, and some of our dervishes have heard it'; is it so?"

"No, my lord," said Qāḍī-zāde, and continued: "Since God the Exalted One has said in the Qur'ān 'There is not a thing but celebrates His praise; and yet ye understand not how they declare His glory' [17/44] (that is to say, all things praise Allāh, yet you cannot understand or hear their praises), for Siwāsī Efendi to say 'We understand and hear it' is a denial of the verse of the Qur'ān, it is blasphemy, the act of an infidel."

The Sulṭān sent for Siwāsī and said: "Qāḍī-zāde says of you that you have denied the Qur'ānic verse and have become an infidel. What do you say?"

Siwāsī said: "O my lord, this fellow is an ignorant stubborn person who is unaware of the interpretation of the Qur'ān. However successfully I argue he will not be convinced. So, be so kind as to invite the Shaykh al-Islām and the Qāḍī-'askers, so that we may have our case judged in their presence."

The Shaykh al-Islām and the Qāḍī-'askers were summoned and the situation was explained to them. Shaykh al-Islām Yaḥyā said: "My lord, it is possible that Qāḍī-zāde thinks we are prejudiced against him. Your imām in the Palace, Khawāja Ḥüseyn Efendi of Damascus, is a learned and virtuous person. Appoint him as arbitrator; let him decide between them, and let us ratify the decision."

Ḥüseyn Efendi was sent for and appointed as arbitrator. Addressing Siwāsī Efendi, he asked: "What is your claim?"

Siwāsī replied: "The manner in which things praise God is through words; the mystics to whom God has given special knowledge hear it."

[Ḥüseyn Ef.], addressing Qāḍī-zāde, said: "What do you say?"

Qāḍī-zāde replied: "We say that, since Allah has said in the Qur'ān 'You cannot hear things praising Allah,' for these people to say 'We hear it' is an opinion contradicting the Qur'ānic text, the act of an infidel."

Siwāsī said: "It has become clear that you are unaware of the interpretation of the Qur'ān, because this verse is addressed to infidels; even if it is general, it is the negation that is general; the whole of it is not a negation.[172] In other words, from the fact that all do not hear and understand, it does not necessarily follow that some of them do not understand. Have you not even studied logic? The opposite of a total negative is a partial affirmative. 'All of you do not understand' means 'some of you hear and understand.' Such verses are many in the Qur'ān; for instance, the orthodox ʿulamā' (ahl-al-Sunna)[173] believe in the vision of Allāh in accordance with the following verse and ḥadīth: 'And some faces, that Day will be sad and dismal' [75/22] 'You will see your lord as you see the moon on a full moon

---

172. The reasoning here is somewhat hard to follow. The text has: "Malūm oldu ki kur'anın tefsirinden bihaber imişsin; zira bu āyeti kerimede hitap kefereyedir; âm olduğu takdirde dahi selbi umumdur; umumı selp değildir; yani cümlenin işidip anlamadiğindan bazılarının işidip anlamamaları lâzımgelmez; mantık dahi okumadın mı? Salibei külliyenin nakizi mucibiei cüziyedir; cümleniz anlamaz; bazınız anlayıp işidir demektir."

173. W.M. Watt, The Formative Period of Islamic Thought (Edinburgh, 1973), p. 268.

night.' However, in the Qur'ān God has said: 'No vision can grasp Him, but His grasp is over.' [6/103] That is to say 'Not all eyes will see,' means 'Some of them will see.'"

In reply to this, Ḥüseyn Ef. recited the following verses: "... he said: 'O ye people we have been taught the speech of birds....' [27/16] and '... one of the ants said: 'O ye ants, get into your habitations....' [27/18] Then he said: 'This verse[174] is proof that the manner in which things praise God is through words, because [in any case] all the prophets and saints have known and heard the praise which is through state of being (ḥāl); that would not be of benefit [to them] in the place of trial.[175] My lord, Siwāsī Efendi is a learned and virtuous man and all his statements are true; in particular .....'"[176]

The Shaykh al-Islām and the two Qāḍī-'askers also confirmed and corroborated this by saying: "What Ḥüseyn Efendi said is true."

Sulṭān Murād Khān reproved and reprimanded [Qāḍī-zāde] severely saying "Shamed again, Qāḍī-zāde?"

Siwāsī said: "O my Sulṭān, according to the tradition (ḥadīth) which Imām Muslim related on the authority of Ibn 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar, 'The [imputation of] unbelief must

---

174. Presumably the latter of the two verses just quoted.
175. The "place of trial" is the world.
176. The text here is clearly corrupt. It looks as if the general meaning to be drawn is that Siwāsī's interpretation of the verses quoted was in conformity with those of all the commentators.

rebound on himself [Qāḍī-zāde] he in his turn, must renew his faith in your presence.'"

The Shaykh al-Islām said: "The jurists also have acted in accordance with the ḥadīth and followed the course of considering [the accuser] an infidel."

Addressing Siwāsī Efendi, the gracious Sulṭān said: "Make Qāḍī-zāde renew his faith!"

Siwāsī Efendi, for his part, recited [to Qāḍī-zāde] the declaration of faith and made him repeat it.[177]

This story is important and has several implications in regard to the intellectual levels of Siwāsī and Qāḍī-zāde, and, at the same time, the attitude of the 'ulamā' towards them both. The story reveals that this was not the first defeat for Qāḍī-zāde against Siwāsī. Perhaps it had occurred several times before. This demonstrates that Qāḍī-zāde was not particularly successful in discussing issues which involved logic. In this respect, his opponent Siwāsī was superior. As will be seen in the next chapter, the Ṣūfīs generally showed an intellectual superiority over the Qāḍī-zādelis. However, the defeats of Qāḍī-zāde, it appears, did not change his position in the sight either of the Sulṭān or of his own followers, who apparently were not much affected by complicated logical or metaphysical arguments. It is clear from the other debate described above (pp.206) Qāḍī-zāde was quite successful in making himself understood by the masses by using a popular anecdote relating directly to everyday life.

---

177. Ergin, op. cit., pp. 199-200.

On the other hand Siwāsī was very intelligent and clever in his arguments and deductions, using logic to prove the inapplicability of the verse quoted by Qāḍī-zāde and the unsoundness of Qāḍī-zāde's understanding of it. His own quotations from the Qur'ān and ḥadīth well supported this purpose. However, his final success in fact came through the help of Hüseyn Efendi, who quoted two more verses more directly supporting Siwāsī's own position.

One important point which emerges is that the 'ulamā' were not on good terms with Qāḍī-zāde, as is seen in both these debates. The 'ulamā' and the established Ṣūfī orders were traditional allies, and Qāḍī-zāde's virulent attacks on both groups merely served to draw them closer together in opposition to him.

One can deduce from these two examples that the controversy between the two shaykhs was carried out on two levels. On the public level Qāḍī-zāde seems to have been more successful, while on the intellectual level the Ṣūfīs were more successful. In both cases, neither Qāḍī-zāde nor Siwāsī failed to retain the favour which they enjoyed from the Sulṭān.

The controversy between the two shaykhs was exploited by several parties, of which Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī had the most to gain in terms of power, prestige and the material benefits that are obtained therefrom. But neither side of the controversy appears to have recognized that the ruling establishment (represented by the Sulṭān and the

high 'ulamā') which they were seeking to influence was actually being given greater power over each of them by being implicitly accepted as the ultimate arbiter; and in the future it would exercise its power to keep one or the other in check by supporting its opponent. The Ṣūfīs, meanwhile, were forced to defend their position in order to maintain their influence, and although they had little to gain,[178] they were aware that they had much to lose at the hands of Qāḍī-zāde and his followers.

It must perhaps be emphasized here that, as far as the 'ilmiyye was concerned, not every member of the official 'ulamā', nor, in fact, its most prominent individuals, participated in the controversy, except in some cases, as arbiters. While it was in the nature of the class as a whole to adopt a negative attitude towards anything new and unfamiliar, once an innovation had found popular acceptance it could be, and was, tolerated on the principle of maṣlaḥa (the common good).[179] Thus while Birgiwī, Qāḍī-zāde and their successors, by their education and training, could be considered as belonging to the 'ilmiyye, they were, in fact, quite unrepresentative in the ardour with which they argued their points and the

178. For the favoured position which the Ṣūfīs enjoyed at court in the early 17th century, see above, pp.101-111

179. N. Berkes, "Iṣlāḥ" in EI^2, V, p. 168. E.g. coffee-drinking and smoking of tobacco.

intolerance they showed to their opponents, often to the embarrassment of the <u>'ilmiyye</u> establishment. They therefore may be regarded as independent scholars with a strict commitment to the <u>Qur'ān</u> and <u>sunna</u> [as well as followers of the Salafī school of thought, hence the representatives of this school in the Ottoman society until the emergence of Wahhābī movement in the following century]. However, contemporary observers realized that it was unlikely that any benefit would emerge from this debate. Kātib Čelebi was to sum up this feeling:

> "In most of the controversies I have mentioned in this book, Qāḍī-zāde took one side and Siwāsī took the other, both going to extremes, and the followers of both used to quarrel and dispute, one against the other. For many years this situation continued, with disputation raging between the two parties, and out of the futile quarrelling a mighty hatred and hostility arose between them. The majority of sheykhs took one side or the other, though the intelligent ones kept out of it, saying, 'This is a profitless quarrel, born of fanaticism. We are all members of the community of Muḥammad, brothers in faith. We have no warrant from Sīvāsi, no diploma from Qāḍī-zāde. They are simply a couple of reverent sheykhs who have won fame by opposing one another; their fame has even reached the ear of the Sulṭān. Thus they have secured their own advantage and basked in the sunshine of the world. Why should we be so foolish as to fight battles for them? We shall get no joy out of it."[180]

---

180. <u>Balance</u>, p. 133.

As pointed out earlier, Kātib Čelebi, like other Ottoman historians, considers the dispute between Siwāsī and Qāḍī-zāde as merely a struggle between two shaykhs for power, fame and recognition. It is true that both shaykhs received recognition and prestige as a result of this dispute but the matter was not as simple as this.

The observations of the historians of this period indicate that they did not fully appreciate Qāḍī-zāde's aims and his concerns with socio-economic problems and religious laxity. They also fail to note that Qāḍī-zāde used these polemics in order to gain the support of the masses and not to come into direct confrontation with the government. [No doubt any controversy in which the public was involved would have some extremism and fanaticism, but this fanaticism was carried out not because of ignorance but because of their firmness and their stand.] It should be added here that the Ṣūfīs were forced by their opponents to enter into the controversy. Both shaykhs differed greatly in their approaches to the issues discussed in their arguments. If this controversy was just trumped-up in order to acquire fame and recognition, how can one explain the continuity of the dispute for three decades in Ottoman society?

CHAPTER V

THE QĀḌĪ-ZĀDE MOVEMENT : THE SECOND PHASE

The Second Phase of the Movement

As has been pointed out in chapter one, following the death of Sulṭān Murād IV in 1640, the decline of the state became more marked and there were even more compelling reasons to search for remedies to cure the widespread malaise and corruption. According to Na'īmā, the followers of Qāḍī-zāde who were regarded as being against corruption, bribery and other illegalities had made the situation worse by involving themselves in the very corruption they sought to eradicate (see below, pp. 252-254).

In 1640, Sulṭān İbrāhīm succeeded Murād IV. He was mentally unfit to rule and devoted himself to the women of the ḥarem. With his extravagant life-style he completely squandered what wealth had been so painstakingly saved by his predecessor.[1]

When Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed departed from this world in 1045/1635 he left behind several students and followers who could maintain his struggle and uphold his ideas. These students were, like him, preachers in the mosques of the capital. Although many movements are called after the name of their founder, the disciples and followers of Qāḍī-zāde identified themselves as "Faqīhler" (jurisconsults). The sources refer to the adherents of the Qāḍī-zāde movement sometimes as the Qāḍī-zādeliler and sometimes, using a popular corruption of faqīh, "Faqılar".

1. Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, part i, pp. 228-31; A. Refīq, Samūr Dewri, 1049-1059 (İstanbul, 1927).

The term Qāḍī-zādelis (Qāḍī-zādeliler) seems to have been an appellation applied to the movement by its adversaries. By giving them a special, new title, their opponents were perhaps trying to create the impression that they were a new group, different from the fuqahā'.

The sources are relatively silent concerning the period which extends from the death of Qāḍī-zāde to the leadership of Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed. However, it seems there was no immediate successor to the leadership of the Qāḍī-zādelis. It would be natural to assume that the remaining members of the Qāḍī-zāde movement carried out their discussions and struggle against the Ṣūfīs individually rather than as a joint group under a particular leader. Yet, they were successful in continuing to build on the relationship begun by Qāḍī-zāde between their movement as a whole and the Palace.

As pointed out previously, during the lifetime of Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed there was a good relationship between the throne and Qāḍī-zāde. This vital link between the members of the group and the Palace was continued after the accession of İbrāhīm in 1640. The Qāḍī-zādeli preachers exercised a great influence on the people, even on the men of the Palace, and in particular on lowly Palace servants.[2] This popularity made the Qāḍī-zādelis feel confident and they became even more intolerant and hostile than their master, Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed, towards the ṭarīqas such as the

---

2. Na'īmā, VI, pp. 236-9; Uzunçarşılı, OT, 111, I, 367.

Mawlawīs and the Khalwatīs, who performed _samā'_, _dawarān_ and _dhikr_ spoken out loud. The supporters of the Qāḍī-zādelis threatened those whose views differed from theirs, so much so that the Mawlawīs and the Khalwatīs no longer would perform these practices in their _tekkes_.[3] Moreover, this growing self-confidence and influence, as pointed out by Na'īmā, made the Qāḍī-zādelis bold enough to declare publicly certain things to be _ḥarām_, although there was no clear evidence for such prohibitions, and they had no right to make such statements at all.[4]

It was during this period of transition for the Qāḍī-zāde movement that Üsṭüwānī, who was to become its second leader, appeared in İstanbul. Although the sources make no mention of this event, it is very likely that he came to İstanbul towards the end of İbrāhīm's reign. It may be assumed that Üsṭüwānī must have spent at least one or two years, perhaps even longer, before he was accepted as leader, and we know from Na'īmā[4a] that this had happened by 1650. It was ofen difficult for an _'ālim_ who came from the Arab provinces of the Ottoman state to enter into the academic circles of the capital and make himself accepted.[5]

---

3. Na'īmā, VI, pp. 236-7.

4. _Ibid_.

4a. See below, note 38.

5. A. Green, _The Tunisian Ulama_ (Leiden, 1978), p. 11; E. Burke, "The Moroccan ulama, 1860-1912 : An introduction" in Keddie (ed.), _op. cit._, p. 102.

His arrival is significant from several points of view. Üsṭüwānī's leadership marks the beginning of the second phase in the movement, because, before his arrival, the followers of Qāḍī-zāde were not united as a group. Üsṭüwānī's efforts brought the Qāḍī-zādeli preachers together and inspired them with a new spirit against the Ṣūfīs. By doing this, he naturally revived the controversy. Another important aspect of the Qāḍī-zāde movement under Üsṭüwānī's leadership was the changed approach of the Qāḍī-zādelis towards their opponents. During the time of Qāḍī-zāde, the bid'a controversies which had unfolded had not gone beyond verbal and written discussions, but during Üsṭüwānī's leadership these controversies became more dangerous, more immoderate and aggressive. If Na'īmā's account is to be believed, the Qāḍī-zāde movement also changed in another way under Üsṭüwānī's leadership. Under his guidance and influence in the Palace, the movement became implicated in the very corruption it sought to remove.[6]

Although the mantle of Ṣūfī leadership had passed to 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī, after the death of Siwāsī in 1049/1640,[6a] we do not see a change of attitude and method in their struggle against the Qāḍī-zādelis. As was always the case with the Ṣūfīs, they preferred a peaceful, innocuous approach rather than recourse to aggression. The personalities of these two leaders, Üsṭüwānī and 'Abd al-

---

6. Na'īmā, op. and loc. cit.

6a. See pp. 231-2, below.

Aḥad Nūrī, played a significant role in the continuing controversy and in the attitudes of their followers during a delicate and crucial period. Their biographies will be given below, together with a description of their works.

Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed Efendi (1017/1608-1072/1661)

Üsṭüwānī's Life

Meḥmed b. Aḥmad b. Ḥüseyn b. Süleymān, known as Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed, was born on 17 Muḥ. 1017/4 May 1608 in Damascus. We have no information concerning his family and his early life.[7]

He probably received his early education locally and afterwards continued his studies under various 'ulamā' in the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus. Muḥibbī mentions some of the teachers under whom he studied. He read Shāfi'ī law with al-Shams al-Maydānī and al-Najm al-Ghāzī, Arabic language and logic with al-Shaykh 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-'Imādī, al-Shaykh 'Abd al-Lāṭīf al-Čaliqī, al-Shaykh 'Umar al-Qārī and Imām Yūsuf b. Abū 'l-Fatḥ, and ḥadīth with Abū 'l-'Abbās al-Makrī, who was in Damascus at that time.

In order to complete his studies he travelled to Cairo, where he studied under scholars of great reputation and fame, such as Burhān al-Laqānī, al-Nūr 'Alī al-Ḥalabī, al-Shaykh 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Yamanī and al-Shams al-Bābilī. He remained there until 1039/1629, when he returned to Damascus. Here he carried on his studies until an

---

7. Biographical information on Üsṭüwānī can be found in Muḥibbī, Khulāṣat al-Athar (Cairo, 1284), III, pp. 386-89; H'A, II, p. 289; 'Ushāqī-zāde, pp. 552-3; M. Thurayya, SO, IV, p. 173.

argument broke out between him and Shaykh Najm al-Ghāzī on some unspecified matter, as a result of which[8] he left his native city and set out for İstanbul by sea. On his way he was captured by the French and held prisoner for a short time. After his release, he succeeded in reaching İstanbul, where he was well received. He later married and settled down, changing his madhhab to the Ḥanafī. (In his early life he had been a follower of the salafiyya-Ḥanbaliyya;[9] he had subsequently become a Shāfiʿī and studied Shafiʿī law.) After finally adopting the Ḥanafī madhhab, he was to adhere to it throughout the rest of his life.

According to ʿUshāqī-zāde, Üsṭüwānī's first employment was to hold study circles in Ayaṣofya Mosque, where he used to teach at the base of the Semāqī column (sütūn-ı Semāqī) whence he received the laqab Üsṭüwānī. Through his teaching he achieved renown in İstanbul and was appointed preacher

8. An alternative account is given by ʿUshāqī-zāde, quoting from the lost history of Shāriḥ al-Manār-zāde, who mentions that he left Damascus because he had killed someone and was fearful of retaliation. See ʿUshāqī-zāde, op. cit., p. 552; Naʿīmā also quotes the same story (VI, p. 57).

9. Since Ibn Taymiyya there had always been a salafī school of thought in Damascus; see J. Voll, "The non-wahhābi Hanbalīs of eighteenth century Syria" in Der Islam 49 (1972), pp. 277-91.

in the Sulṭān Aḥmad Mosque. On the other hand Muḥibbī states that his first appointment was to the Sulṭān Aḥmad Mosque as imām and makes no mention of his teaching in the Ayaṣofya. In the year 1063/1652 he left Istanbul to perform the Ḥajj. On his return to Istanbul he was appointed preacher in the Fātiḥ Mosque, where in 1065/1654 he succeeded Welī Ef., who had died that year. His eloquent and moving sermons had a great influence on the masses, and he revived the argument between the followers of Qāḍī-zāde (d. 1635) and Siwāsī (d. 1639). Üsṭüwānī mainly took his discourses along the well-worn paths of dispute in Islamic society, and concentrated on those matters which, although not of great importance in themselves, were able to attract large congregations and mobilise the masses. As it happened, instances of the latter had been a common source of dispute between the followers of Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī in the reign of Murād IV. Among Üsṭüwānī's more influential followers were bostāncılar (gardeners)[10] baltacılar (wood-cutters)[11] and ḥelvacılar (sweet-makers)[12] from the Palace. Through them Üsṭüwānī was to obtain an introduction to the court, where he later came under the protection of Reyḥān Agha, the tutor to the Sulṭān.[13] Owing

---

10. Gibb-Bowen, i p. 350; Uzunçarşılı, "Bostandjilar' in EI².
11. Idem, I, p. 86, 359-60.
12. Idem, I, pp. 348, 357, 359.
13. Na'īmā, V, p. 54.

to this sponsorship, the fame of Üsṭüwānī spread and he became known as "Pādishāh sheykhī". His prestige then attracted an even wider following among the people, and his preaching became more rigidly orthodox than ever. In relating this, Na'īmā emphasises that he himself hesitates to use the strong language of his source. Instead, he says he will content himself with "a milder summary":

> "But because he was excessively respectful of the outward rules of the sharī'a, capable of establishing and communicating his virtue and ability, and a bold orator, he encouraged the ḥelwacıs and the bostāncıs and even the literate element among the servants of the Enderūn-ı Hümāyūn[14] to read. The reputation of his virtue having spread to the ghılmān-ı khāṣṣa and aghāyān-ı Dār al-Sa'āda,[15] they too became devoted to him and a unity came into existence between them [them and him]. In particular, because Khwāja Reyḥān Agha, who was tutor to the Sulṭān, had some share

---

14. Enderūn: the inner part (third and fourth courts) of the Palace, as opposed to the Bīrūn, the outer part of the Palace.; "Enderūn" in EI², II, 697-8. The ghılmān-ı khāṣṣa were the pages (içoğlanları) serving in the Sulṭān's Privy Chamber (Khaṣṣ Oda); see İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı, (Ankara, 1945), p. 331.

15. In the singular, the expression Dār al-Sa'āda Aghası usually denotes the chief black eunuch of the Palace, who was in charge of the Harem (see Gibb-Bowen, I, 76; İnalcık, Empire, 86). Here, however, the use of the plural form aghāyān suggests that the reference is to the Enderūn (or Harem?) aghas in general.

in the knowledge of particular sciences, such as jurisprudence, Arabic studies, Qur'ān recitation and literary composition, and was a determined agha, and since he was naturally eager for the stream of fanaticism, he showed affection towards Üsṭüwānī and, through the giving of gifts and the showing of honour, caused him to be popular and renowned in the Enderūn and the Bīrūn. This reached such a point that eventually he [Üsṭüwānī] was admitted to the Khāṣṣ Oda where, contrary to the qānūn, a pulpit (kürsī) was set up and he began delivering sermons. They [those who heared him] caused a tumult in the city, saying 'He is the shaykh of the Padishah.' Those who, whether genuinely or falsely, were inclined to the way of fanaticism and the display of piety assembled in the circle of the above-mentioned shaykh and became his devoted servants (mürīd)."[16]

By 1065/1654, Üsṭüwānī and other preachers, such as Türk Aḥmad, Dīwāne Muṣṭafā and Čawush-zāde, through their provocative sermons had brought their supporters to a pitch of fanaticism that was to make conflict between them and their opponents inevitable. The first incident occurred one Friday in 1066/1656 in the Fātiḥ Mosque when a group of Qāḍī-zādelis and their opponents, the Ṣūfīs, confronted one another and bloodshed was only narrowly averted.[17] Following this event, the Grand Vizier Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha held an immediate investigation to discover what had caused it, as a result of which Üsṭüwānī and his two friends, Türk Aḥmad and Dīwāne Muṣṭafā, were exiled to Cyprus. Shortly afterwards, in 1067/1656, Üsṭüwānī was commanded to return to his native town, Damascus, where he spent the remainder of his life.[18]

Here he engaged in teaching Qur'ānic reading and

---

16. Na'īmā, V, p. 54.
17. See below, pp.
18. 'Ushāqī-zāde, p. 553.

preaching in the Umayyad Mosque. His sermons attracted a vast audience who had not yet heard such topics discussed as those which he treated. Muḥibbī records some verses in praise of him composed by al-Emir . al-Manjikī.

ان سمع العقول يصغي لقول الاسطواني والقلوب لديه
جمع الفضل والمكارم حتى وكل حسنى تعزى وتنمى اليه
رجل جاء في الزمان أخيرا يحسد الاول الاخير عليه

19

After a while he was transferred from the Umayyad Mosque to the Salīmīyya medrese, and later, also, appointed mutawallī of the Bīmāristān, in which latter employment he acquired great wealth. When Shaykh Su'ūd al-Ghāzī was dismissed from the post of müftī in the Umayyad Mosque, Üsṭüwānī and a certain Shaykh Maḥāsinī were applicants for the appointment; the position was given to his rival, and Üsṭüwānī was so upset that he fell ill and died of fever on 16 Muḥ. 1072/11 September 1661).[20] He was buried in the Farādis cemetery. Shaykh 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulsī wrote a chronogram on his death.[21]

قد مات حاوي العلوم طرا — محمد كعبة الوفود
الاسطواني طود علم — ومن تسامى بفرط جود
فقد كل الانام ارخ — ممات علامة الوجود

(1072)

---

19. Muḥibbī, op. cit., p. 387.

20. Muḥibbī, op. cit., p. 388; 'Ushāqī-zāde, p. 553.

21. Muḥibbī, ibid.

The Works of Üsṭüwānī

Although Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed Ef. is described as having a profound knowledge of Islam, he did not produce any books or risālas.[22] He spent his whole life teaching and preaching to the masses who were influenced by his great eloquence. Indeed, his qualities as a preacher are described in all the sources which deal with his life, and one may suppose that he regarded this as his true vocation and consequently did not devote much time to study and writing. He applied himself in all his efforts to a rigorous defence of the sharīʻa and the sunna, identifying and condemning innovations and what he saw as non-Islamic practices.[23] In this he was to achieve certain successes, but unfortunately his enthusiasm inspired some of his followers to bigotry and fanaticism.

In spite of his own lack of literary output, it is possible to form an idea of Üsṭüwānī's character and thought, through a risāla written by one of his students, in which some of his sermons and teachings are recorded. This book is called Kitāb-ı Üsṭüwānī or Üsṭüwānī risālesi.[24]

---

22. Ismāʻīl Pasha mentions a risāla by him on ṣalāt in H'A, II, p. 289.
23. ʻUshāqī-zāde narrates some incidents to show his sensitivity on this issue; see op. cit., p. 553.
24. H. Yurdaydın, "Üstüvanī Risālesi" in İFD, X (1963), pp. 71-8. The MSS. listed under Üsṭüwānī on p 427, below, are all copies of this same risāla, despite their different titles.

Written in a simple and clear Turkish, it deals with the basic beliefs of Islam and the problems which a Muslim may face in his daily application of these beliefs.

The book or risāla is divided into various sections numbering about sixty, each being devoted to a special topic. The author is systematic in his presentation, giving for each subject a brief and informative introduction before dealing in detail with the questions and problems relating thereto.[25]

Üsṭüwānī, as might be expected, is strictly orthodox in his approach to these subjects, but he has the ability to convey his teaching in a simple form that can be generally understood. Frequently, and indeed as a matter of practice, he supports his explanations by reference to a respectable authority, demonstrating that the position he is advocating is consistent with the learned traditions of Islam, as well as showing his own familiarity with the classical texts.

While Üsṭüwānī may not be considered a typical Islamic scholar, having left no book of his own authorship, he was apparently as assiduous a compiler of sources as any of the more conventional ʿulamāʾ. Among the works which he is shown as quoting are such well-known texts as:

Tafsīr al-Kashshāf, Multaqā, al-Tarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya,

---

25. In the article by H. Yurdaydın, the author gives the full contents of the risāla as well as some analysis of Üsṭüwānī's approach to the issues which were treated in the risāla.

Hidāye, Qudūrī and so on. He also uses some of the fatwā collections, such as Fatāwa Bazzāzīyya Jāmi' al-Fatwā and Jawāhir al-Fatāwā.

'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī (1003/1594 – 1061/1650)

When 'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī died in 1049/1639, 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī succeeded him as leader of the Ṣūfīs in their struggle against the Qāḍī-zādelis. He was to lead the Ṣūfīs in the second phase of the Qāḍī-zāde controversy, a phase during which the Ṣūfīs came under actual physical attack from their opponents.

'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī led the Ṣūfīs at a very delicate period. This leadership was accompanied by deep scholarship and a large literary output. He produced a book or risāla on every single issue which was in dispute with the Qāḍī-zādelis. In view of his obvious importance, his life and works will be discussed below.

His Life.[26]

Al-Shaykh Ewḥad al-Dīn 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī b. Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā Ṣafāyī b. Ismā'īl b. Abī 'l-Barakāt al-Siwāsī, usually known as 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī Efendi, was born in 1003/1594[27] in Siwās, where his father

---

26. The sources of biographical information on 'Abd al-Aḥad are: 'Ushāqī-zāde, pp. 539-41; OM, I, pp. 121-2; H'A, I, p. 493; SO, III, p. 294; Muḥibbī, Khulāṣat al-Athar, II, p. 269; A. Ḥilmī, Ziyārat-i Awliyā', (İstanbul, 1325), pp. 88-90.
27. On the date of his birth, A. Ḥilmī gives the date as 1013, which is wrong; op. cit., p. 88.

held the office of qāḍī. His father's profound knowledge of religion and pious personality made him well-known and respected in the province. His mother was the sister of the famous shaykh 'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī (d. 1049/1639).

Having come from a learned family, 'Abd al-Aḥad naturally had his first education at home and afterwards he was left in the hands of his maternal uncle, 'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī, who at that time was considered a master in 'ilm-i ẓāhir and 'ilm-i bāṭın and was leader of the Khalwatiyya order of dervishes in Siwās. As might be expected, under the supervision of his uncle 'Abd al-Aḥad must have received a good education as well as Ṣūfī training. This education came to an end when his master 'Abd al-Majīd was invited to go to Istanbul by Sulṭān Murād III, around the year 1010 or 1011/1601 or 1602.[28] It was fortunate for 'Abd al-Aḥad that his master took him to Istanbul with him.

Here he studied under the distinguished 'ulamā' of the age and completed his studies in 'ilm-i ẓāhir. At the same time, 'Abd al-Aḥad continued to study 'ilm-i bāṭın and to receive training in the Ṣūfī way of life under the instruction of his uncle.[29]

---

28. Cf. Life and Works of Siwāsī, pp. 180-81.

29. 'Ushāqī-zāde writes as follows:

> "'Ulamā'-ı 'aṣr ve fuḍalā'-ı dehirden taḥṣīl-i 'ulūm-ı ẓāhir ve kendülerinden [Siwāsī] tekmīl-i ādāb-ı tarīqat itmekle irtifā'-i merātib-i baṭına eyledikten sonra....." op. cit., p. 541.

His first appointment was on the island of Mytilene where he was a preacher and represented the Khalwatī order of dervishes. It is not known when he left for this island and how long he stayed there, but it is stated in the sources that he returned to Istanbul in 1033/1623, and was given the leadership of Meḥmed Agha Tekke.[30] There he spent several years as a teacher and preacher, as a result of which he became well-known and was promoted to the Fātiḥ Mosque, where he succeeded ʻOthmān Ef. of Bosna (d. 1074/1663)[31] in 1041/1631. Here he stayed for a period of nearly ten years before being transferred to the Bāyazīd Mosque, where he replaced Silkī ʻOthmān Ef. in 1051/1640.[32] After spending an unspecified period there he was finally promoted to the Ayasofya Mosque, where he succeeded Awliyā' Dāmādı Meḥmed Ef. He remained in this post for the rest of his life. He died on the first Friday of Ṣafar 1061/29 January 1650.[33] His departure from this world was a shock to all Ṣūfīs and to the people of Istanbul, who loved and respected him. He was buried next to his father-in-law, Shaykh ʻAbd al-Majīd Siwāsī, in ʻEyyūb. The following chronogram was written for him.[34]

(1061) عبد الاحد افندی اولسون مقیم جنت

---

30. A. Ḥilmī, op. cit., p. 89; ʻUshāqī-zāde, op. cit., p. 540.

31. ʻUshāqī-zāde, op. cit., p. 551.

32. Ibid.

33. ʻUshāqī-zāde, op. cit., p. 540.

34. Ibid.; OM, I, p. 121.

The Works of ʻAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī

In spite of the troubled and eventful period in which ʻAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī was leader of the Ṣūfīs, he managed an output of around thirty risālas and books. He also encouraged his followers to improve their own scholarship and defeat their opponents through the written word.

Although not all of his works are extant, those that have survived reveal a profound knowledge of the sharīʻa and taṣawwuf and a well-balanced scholarly approach. In his works, he predictably defends the practices and beliefs of the Ṣūfīs, and the corpus of his books are a valuable guide to an understanding of the Ṣūfī position vis-à-vis the Qāḍī-zādelis.

Three of his works are of special relevance in this study:

1. Taʼdīb al-mutamarridīn. The work is in Turkish and deals with the faith of the parents of the Prophet. The author divides his work into three parts with an introduction and conclusion. The first bāb is devoted to the Qurʼānic verses and prophetic traditions which indicate the faith of the parents of the Prophet and their association with the Millet-i Ḥanīfa (5a-10b). The second bāb discusses opposing views on this issue and the author tries to prove that the upholders of the view opposite to his are in error. The third bāb concentrates on the purity of the Prophet's

dynasty and the obvious proofs of his prophethood.[35]

2. Maw'iẓa ḥasana. This work is in Arabic and is a collection of his sermons on several issues concerning the religious life in this world and the life in the next. The author divides the book into twenty-five majlis (assembly), under each of which he explains several issues and interprets Qur'ānic verses.[36]

3. Fī ḥaqq al-dawarān al-Ṣūfiyya. This is in Turkish and Arabic and is devoted to a defence of the Ṣūfī practice of dawarān against its opponents. The author first makes a differentiation between dawarān and raqṣ. Later on he quotes earlier Ṣūfī sources to substantiate his arguments.[37]

---

35. A. Nūrī, Ta'dīb al-mutamarridīn, İstanbul University Library, MS, Tyz. 1738.
36. A. Nūrī, Maw'iẓa ḥasana (İstanbul, 1309).
37. This risāla is included in a collection published, presumably in İstanbul, in Arabic script without any title or date.

The Attacks on the Ṣūfīs by the Qāḍī-zādelis

[1058/1648 - 1087/1656]

With Üsṭüwānī increasing in power and influence in the Palace and among the Palace servants, his followers gained confidence and superiority over their rivals and their virulent campaign against the Ṣūfīs entered a new phase.

Under the leadership of Üsṭüwānī, the Qāḍī-zādelis, around the year 1061/1650,[38] mounted their campaign from two directions, the first being the pulpits and the second the Palace, "where they influenced appointments and promotions."[38a] Amongst the famous preachers who supported Usṭüwānī were Shaykh Welī (d. 1065/1654),[39] who was notorious for his predilection for worldly goods, Čawush-zāde (Cawush Oghlu),[40] who was considered to be a narrow-minded extremist, Köse Meḥmed, Ma'jūnju Hamza, Shaykh 'Othmān, who was imām of the iç oghlanlar in the Palace and preacher in the Süleymāniye Mosque, Čelebi Shaykh, whose father was Shaykh of Erdebīlī Tekke and finally Hüseyn Efendi, the preacher of Orta Jāmi'i.[41]

---

38. Na'īmā first mentions Üsṭüwānī among the events of 1061/1650; see Na'īmā, V, pp. 53-7.

38a. Na'īmā, VI, p. 223.

39. Sh. Welī was a student of Qāḍī-zāde himself and became a preacher in İstanbul, where he succeeded 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī in the Fātiḥ Mosque in 1640. See 'Ushāqī-zāde, p. 544.

40. Na'īmā, V, p. 54.

41. Ibid.

These preachers presented a united front to campaign against the Ṣūfīs. They did not restrict their attacks to the Ṣūfīs and their practices, but had even denounced as an infidel the highest religious authority in the state, who was probably connected with the Ṣūfīs, namely the Shaykh al-Islām Yaḥyā Ef. (d. 1054/1644);[42] this was clearly an act of fanaticism that would outrage the sensibility of all men of understanding. This incident had occurred several years before Üsṭüwānī's appearance on the scene, when one of the preachers, Čawush-zāde, was delivering a sermon in the Fātiḥ Mosque and referred to the following beyt from the dīwān of Shaykh al-Islām Yaḥyā.

> "In the mosque let hypocrites indulge in their
> hypocrisy
> Come you to the tavern where you'll neither sham
> nor shammer see."[43]

In this connection Čawush-zāde declared:

> "O people of Muḥammad, anyone who recites this line is an infidel, because this is clear infidelity."[44]

---

42. G. Akyürek, XVII. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Şeyhül İslāmları, İstanbul University graduation dissertation, no. 3225, pp. 9-12, 1963; Danişmend, Kronoloji, V, pp. 122, 123.
43. Translated by J.R. Walsh, The Penguin Book of Turkish Verse, ed. N. Menemencioğlu (London, 1978), p. 100.
44. Na'īmā, V, p. 55.

According to Na'īmā, among his audience people who had the slightest knowledge of poetry said "What fearlessness, what is the meaning of declaring the <u>müftī</u> of the time an infidel?"and in anger and aversion they left the mosque. This event probably took place in his last period in the office of the <u>Shaykh al-Islām</u> which ended with his death in 1644.[45]

There is some evidence that this anti-Ṣūfī propaganda had an effect on the common people. According to Na'īmā, the Qāḍī-zādelis created a feeling of suspicion and hostility amongst the masses against the Mawlawī and Khalwatī orders. The Qāḍī-zādelis even suggested that the very act of entering a <u>tekke</u> was the act of an infidel (<u>küfr</u>).[46]

As for the Ṣūfīs, it can only be assumed, since the sources are silent on this matter, that they pursued their usual policy of remaining in their <u>tekkes</u> and refraining

---

45. Na'īmā, <u>loc. cit.</u>, M. Kemāl, <u>Dīwān-ı Yaḥyā</u> (İstanbul, 1334) p. 46. We are told that Yaḥyā Ef. did not want to punish this preacher, whose remarks he considered as the barking of a dog, and said the following lines:

" واذا اتتك مذمتي من ناقص - فهي الشهادة لي بانّي كامل "

See M. Kemāl, <u>op.</u> and <u>loc. cit</u>

46. Na'īmā, pp. 54-5.

from confrontation with their opponents. They may well have been preparing themselves at this stage for their intellectual offensive against the Qāḍī-zādelis.[47]

Na'īmā suggests that there was an identifiable group of individuals who deliberately inflamed the controversy by attending the meetings of both parties and reporting exaggerated versions of the positions held by each camp. He does not, however, attribute a motive to such people but identifies them as Kāghıd Emīni Hüseyn, Zihgīrji Süleymān, 'Arab 'Abd al-Raḥmān and others, who he suggests enjoyed observing the quarrels and rivalry of the two groups.[48] One may speculate that this group consisted of men who placed their own interests above all else and, by playing up to the Qāḍī-zādelis especially, hoped to acquire promotion and influence. This was, after all, the period when the power and influence of the Qāḍī-zādelis in the Palace had reached its zenith.

Aware of support from the Palace and from some of the common people, the Qāḍī-zādelis for the first time resorted to violent means in order to overcome their opponents. Seeking a pretext for violence against the Ṣūfīs, the Qāḍī-zādelis attacked a fatwā of Shaykh al-Islām Bahā-'ī Efendi in favour of smoking, an issue much exploited by the Qāḍī-zādelis in their sermons and discussions.[49] In 1650, they

---

47. Cf. below, pp. 245-8.

48. Na'īmā, loc. cit.

49. Cf. the discussion on tobacco, p. 327 below.

began holding secret meetings in which they decided to promote hostile propaganda against the Shaykh al-Islām. Through the help of their followers in the Palace they succeeded in acquiring a fermān from the Grand Vizier Melek Aḥmed Pasha, who held the office from August 1650 to August 1651,[50] ordering the demolition of some Ṣūfī tekkes. When the fermān was delivered, the Qāḍī-zādelis themselves immediately began implementing it with the help of soldiers, and launched their first attack on the Khalwatī tekke in Demür Qapu, where not only did they destroy the building but they also physically attacked those who were in the tekke.[51] They then proceeded to the other tekkes, beginning with the Ekmel Tekkesi,[52] another Khalwatī tekke in the Atmeydānı. But the news of their plans reached the ear of the Ṣamsuncu Bashı,[53] ʿÖmer Agha (d. 1063/1652),[54] a follower of Shaykh ʿÖmer Efendi (d. 1069/1658),[55] the shaykh of the tekke in question.

---

50. Danişmend, Kronoloji, V, p. 38.

51. Naʿīmā, V, p. 57.

52. H. Göktürk, "Ekmel Tekkesi" in İstanbul Ansiklopedisi, (Istanbul, 1968), IX, pp. 498-9.

53. The Ṣamsuncıs (mastiff-keepers) were the 71st orta of the Janissaries; their commander, the Ṣamsuncı Bashı, was one of the leading officers of the corps. See İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları, I (Ankara, 1943), pp. 202-3; Gibb-Bowen, I, pp. 314-15.

54. SO, III, p. 586.

55. ʿUshāqī-zāde, p. 549.

He extended his protection to this _tekke_ and posted fifteen soldiers for its defence while he himself participated in the _dhikr_ on the evening when the attack was scheduled to occur. The attack did not take place. Having recognized that armed confrontation could only lead to bloodshed, the leader of the Qul Ketkhüdāsı,[56] Čelebi Ketkhüdā Beg, who was an admirer of Shaykh ʻÖmer Ef., immediately went to the Grand Vizier and persuaded him to issue another _fermān_ by which it was forbidden to attack _tekkes_ or to interfere in their rituals. The contents of the new _fermān_ and the invalidity of the previous one was made known to the Qāḍī-zādelis. This new decree brought an end to the attacks of the Qāḍī-zādelis against the Ṣūfīs for some time.[57]

As pointed out by Kaydu, the soldiers also took part in these attacks and acts of destruction:

> "The government troops attacked the Ṣūfī houses with drawn swords. The dancing and the rituals of the dervishes were suppressed and the dervishes were beaten up."[58]

---

56. The _Qul Ketkhüdāsı_ was the second-in-command of the Janissary corps; see İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, _op. cit._, pp. 195-9.
57. Naʻīmā, V, p. 56.
58. E. Kaydu, _Die Institution des Scheyh ul-Islamat im Osmanischen Staat_, Nurnberg, 1971, pp. 97-8.

This lull in the struggle was not to last long, because the Qāḍī-zādelis became agitated and restless as a reaction to the frustration of their plans. In order to renew their attacks they held a secret meeting at the home of Potur Ḥasan, one of their members. Subsequently they agreed to seek a fatwā from the Shaykh al-Islām Bahā'ī Ef. on the illegality of dawarān and samā', in order to justify their actions. They were successful in obtaining one. They then sent letters of warning to the Ṣūfī leaders. Among these was the following letter signed by Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed and sent as a warning to the Shaykh 'Abd al-Karīm Čelebi (d. 1106/1694).[59]

> "It has become an obligation to stop you. Since you have been performing raqṣ and dawarān, we will raid your tekke, murder you and your followers, dig up the foundations of your tekke to the depth of a few arshın and pour its earth into the sea. So long as this degree of care is not shown, it will not be lawful to perform the ṣalāt in that place."[60]

On receipt of this letter, Shaykh 'Abd al-Karīm paid a visit at once to the Shaykh al-Islām, Bahā'ī Ef., who was enraged by the contents of this letter and reacted by sending a brief note[61] to Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed, demanding

59. 'Ushāqī-zāde, pp. 694-703.

60. Na'īmā, V, p. 57.

61. "Sen-ki Usṭüwānīsin, [bu] waraqa wuṣūlünde gelesün, mukhālefet iderseñ ḍarar čekmeñ muqarrerdür." ibid.

him to account for his actions. The leader of the Qāḍī-zādelis was terrified by this note and assured the messenger that he would go to the Shaykh al-Islām. However, he realized that he had committed a grave tactical error, which he attempted to put right by visiting the Grand Vizier to obtain his intercession. At the request of the other officials and Palace servants, the Grand Vizier asked the re'īs ül-küttāb at the time, Mewqūfātī Meḥmed Efendi,[62] to mediate. The re'is ül-küttāb went to the Shaykh al-Islām and conveyed the Grand Vizier's selāms and best wishes. Then, on behalf of the Grand Vizier, he asked the Shaykh al-Islām to pardon Usṭüwānī. The Shaykh al-Islām, Bahā'ī Ef., who seems to have anticipated this move, expressed his concern at the situation, which he felt was a result of the activities of the Qāḍī-zādelis. He is reported as saying:

> "Look, Efendi, while in the [Ottoman] state bribes are still being taken, positions are being sold to the highest bidder and so many reprehensible affairs from the category of disapproved and shameful acts are being perpetuated, why has it been considered necessary to protect such mischief-makers as these, who ought to be hanged? This dawarān of the Ṣūfīs and [its] denial by the fuqahā' is an old story and a long-standing, ancient issue. I therefore, for my part, in issuing a fatwā declaring the illegality of raqṣ in accordance with the clear indication of the sharī'a, have

---

62. Danişmend, Kronoloji, V, p. 332. Na'īma, V, p. 64.

> acted in conformity and agreement with [my] predecessors.[63] But this [much] is certain: that [although] there were many great Sulṭāns and so many strong Viziers before your master, and müftīs who were more learned and wise than me, and although fatwās were issued in order to preserve the state and to respect the clear tenor of the Sharī'a, yet nobody went so far as to strike, kill, or stop the Ṣūfīs. Why has it become important that a group of wicked-spirited mischief-seekers have surrounded the ten-year-old, innocent, pure Sulṭān of Islām and exposed him to the curse of the fuqarā' [the Ṣūfīs]?[64] For certain, whether Üsṭüwānī is punished or not, I will shave off his beard and put him in the galleys."[65]

Having said this, Bahā'ī Efendi showed Üsṭüwānī's letter to the re'is ül-küttāb, who now being acquainted with the real nature of the situation offered his apologies and

---

63. Kaydu (op. cit., p. 95) says that Bahā'ī Efendi did not issue a fatwā against raqṣ and dawarān. It would appear that he disregarded this statement by Bahā'ī Ef.
64. This apparently puzzling question posed by the Shaykh al-Islām can, it seems to me, only be understood as a heavily ironical reference to the position taken by the Grand Vizier in this affair.
65. Na'īmā, V, p. 57.

left the office in chagrin. The Shaykh al-Islām then summoned the Qāḍī of Istanbul, Es'ad Ef. (d. 1066/1656)[66] to his office and ordered him to call the Qāḍī-zādelis one by one and forbid each to speak against the Ṣūfīs and their practices. Es'ad Ef.'s action had the required effect upon the Qāḍī-zādelis and they once again ceased their attacks for an unspecified period.[66a]

As may be expected, this temporary truce came to an end through the activities of the Qāḍī-zādelis, who broke this silence in order to provoke their opponents. It was Čawush-zāde who opened the next chapter in this controversy by once again denouncing the Ṣūfīs from the pulpit as innovators who included whirling in their ritual, and indulged in the paradox of chanting the words of the shahāda in a manner held by the Qāḍī-zādelis to be un-Islamic. For this he denounced them as infidels. The Ṣūfīs, who were represented at this point by Dhākir-zāde (1068/1657),[67] a follower of 'Azīz Maḥmūd Hüdāyī, and the preacher in the Fātiḥ Mosque, replied as follows:

> "A shameless fellow by the name of Čawush-oghlı has said a nonsensical thing. People of piety and spiritual guidance who have been the great men of the religion of Islām have recommended dawarān and dhikr as being among the principles of the ṭarīqa.[68] Those who unjustly declare the people

---

66. 'Ushāqī-zāde, p. 210.

66a. Na'īmā, op. and loc. cit.

67. 'Ushāqī-zāde, pp. 544-5.

68. Here it refers to the Ṣūfī way of life in general.

> who proclaim God's unity to be infidels are [themselves] infidels."[69]

This statement seems to have been sufficient to silence the Qāḍī-zādelis, who once again ceased their attacks. This was indeed a clear victory for the Ṣūfīs.

Čawush-zāde's father-in-law, the famous preacher Erdebīlī-zāde (d. 1080/1669)[70] returned from the Ḥajj at this point, and when he was informed of the challenges issued by his son-in-law, harshly rebuked him because of his attitudes towards the Ṣūfīs and then issued a challenge to the Qāḍī-zādelis stating that anyone who had a complaint against the Ṣūfīs should direct it to himself, as he had answers for them. The Qāḍī-zādelis, perhaps having realized their situation, did not respond. Üsṭüwānī was to comment on this as follows:

> "Since he is an <u>ehl-i ḥāl</u> [someone who has attained an inner knowledge of God] and is saintly, we do not have anything to say against him. [Our objection] is to those who are unaware of <u>ḥāl</u> and are frivolous."[71]

As we have already seen from the beginning of the attacks, the Ṣūfīs never defended themselves by resorting to violence as did their opponents. As usual, they always tried to use peaceful means in the face of violence. Their

---

69. Na'īmā, V, pp. 58-9.

70. 'Ushāqī-zāde, p. 555.

71. Na'īmā, V, p. 59.

approach was intellectual. The Qāḍī-zādelis responded by altering their tactics and abandoned the appeal to reason and increasingly favoured direct confrontation, reducing the debate to a match of strength.

The Ṣūfīs also realized the intellectual advantage they held, and counter-attacked by criticising Birgiwī's al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya, which was regarded as a guide and source of inspiration for the Qāḍī-zādelis. The leader of the Ṣūfīs, ʿAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī (d. 1061/1650), encouraged all his followers to approach this work from different points of view. The first to respond to this appeal was Kürd Meḥmed (d. 1084/1673)[72] who wrote a commentary on al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya, entitled "Sharḥ ʿalā ʾl-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya", in which he defended some of the Ṣūfī practices condemned by Birgiwī. His attack was made under the guise of an investigation into the authenticity of the traditions (aḥādīth) cited in the Ṭarīqa. His commentary was well received by the Ṣūfīs, who disseminated it among their members. When the Qāḍī-zādelis obtained a copy of his work, they subjected it to a thorough investigation for possible heresy or mistakes. Not surprisingly, they succeeded in identifying certain errors and deviations from orthodoxy. They proclaimed the author of the commentary an infidel, and therefore an apostate, who by law should be executed. Accordingly, they appealed to

72. M. Aynī, Türk Ahlakçıları, p. 116; OM, II, p. 8. Naʿīmā, V, pp. 265-6.

the Shaykh al-Islām and advanced their arguments. At the same time they had their supporters in the Palace, men such as Reyḥān Agha, to lobby the Grand Vizier of the time, and to put pressure on the Shaykh al-Islām to support the Qāḍī-zādelis.[73] The Shaykh al-Islām, Bahā'ī Ef., having noted the zeal and strength of the mood of the Qāḍī-zādelis, attempted to placate their anger by offering to punish Kürd Meḥmed. Meanwhile, Kürd Meḥmed, having witnessed the reaction of the Qāḍī-zādelis to his work, and the resultant developments, took his work to Bahā'ī Ef. and explained his position, defending his views thus, as reported by Na'īmā:

> "My lord, the interpretation of the verses which are under discussion is taken from the works of accepted authorities, like Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī, al-Ghazālī and Rāghib al-Isfahāṇī."[74]

Bahā'ī Ef., realizing the situation and the realities underlying the controversy, advised Kürd Meḥmed not to demonstrate every truth of which he was aware, and then requested him to distance himself from the city for a period of time. Kürd Meḥmed realized that his position was hopeless, gave up his job and quit the capital. He went to Bursa, where he died in 1084/1673.[75]

Of course, the Qāḍī-zādelis interpreted this develop-

---

73. Na'īmā, V, p. 266.

74. Na'īmā, V, p. 267.

75. Aynī, op. cit., p. 116.

ment as a victory for themselves and this temporarily discouraged the Ṣūfīs. It seems, however, that the Ṣūfīs were determined in their struggle, and therefore, after a short interval, another member of their group, the imām of Meḥmed Agha Mosque, known as Tatar Imām (ʿAlī b. Ḥasan b. Ṣadaqa),[76] a man respected in scholarly circles, formulated an attack on the Qāḍī-zādelis in a work entitled Idrāk al-ḥaqīqa fī takhrīj aḥādīth al-Ṭarīqa.[77] This he presented to the Shaykh al-Islam Ebū Saʿīd Ef. (d. 1073/1662).[78] At this particular time, Birgiwī's grandson, ʿIṣmetī Ef. (d. 1076/1665),[79] by chance happened to be visiting the Shaykh al-Islām, who gave the work to him so that he could assess its contents. He quickly surveyed Taṭar Imām's commentary. This sufficed to indicate its controversial nature, and ʿIṣmetī Ef. returned the work to the Shaykh al-Islām, indicating his tacit approval.[80] It was not long before the Qāḍī-zādelis found out about the existence of this work. With a confidence born of their recent victory over Kürd Meḥmed,

76. Aynī, op. cit., p. 111.

77. ibid

78. ʿUshāqī-zāde, pp. 258-63.

79. ʿUshāqī-zāde, pp. 287-90.

80. In fact, ʿIṣmetī Efendi himself translated Birgiwī's Ṭarīqa into Turkish (see Aynī, op. cit., p. 113). Being well-acquainted with its contents, therefore, he was easily able to detect the intention behind Tatar Imām's work; see also Naʿīmā, V, pp. 265-6.

they approached the Shaykh al-Islām and demanded the death of Tatar Imām, seeking a public condemnation of the commentary. The Shaykh al-Islām placated these zealots and innocently requested to have the work brought to him for his perusal, at the same time summoning its author. Tatar Imām, having been advised of this development, came directly to the Shaykh al-Islām and declared:

> "The Qāḍī-zādelis disturbed my lord. If, as they wish, my death becomes necessary, the order belongs only to God. I remind you, however, that I am not a man like Kürd Meḥmed to leave the city through fear of them."[81]

Having made this point, he challenged the Qāḍī-zādelis to a public discussion in the Fātiḥ Mosque. The following day he brought all his sources to the mosque and awaited them, but, as one might expect, the Qāḍī-zādelis did not respond to this sort of challenge, and they did not turn up. This is not to suggest that the Qāḍī-zādelis were backing away from a confrontation. They merely avoided a forum in which the advantage lay with the better educated and more intellectually versatile contender. Rather they reacted by mounting a campaign of invective against Tatar Imām. They appealed to their supporters in the Palace who argued that for Tatar Imām to challenge the authority of a past scholar such as Birgiwī was gross impudence and impiety.[82] They attributed Tatar Imām's

---

81. Na'īmā, V, p. 268.

82. *Ibid.*

actions to the inspiration of Satan, and warned the Sulṭān of the consequences of allowing such a man to wander free in society, reminding the Sulṭān of his duty as guardian of the Holy Law and society in general.[83]

This strategy worked, and the young Sulṭān ordered the Shaykh al-Islām, now Bahā'ī Ef. once again, to summon the 'ulamā' to a meeting which was to be held on 13 Ṣafar 1063/14 January 1653. In this assembly the 'ulamā', presided over by the Shaykh al-Islām, discussed the case in detail and reached the conclusion formulated in the following summary:

> "The commentaries [including those of Kürd Meḥmed and Tatar Imām] on al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya are unacceptable and are to be renounced. Furthermore, the works of previous 'ulamā' must also be protected from every sort of criticism which may discredit the reputation of the author as well as the work itself."[84]

In addition to this, they issued a warning to Tatar Imām not to indulge in this kind of activity, although they themselves could not face him in public discussion.

Throughout the account of this controversy, based as it is mainly on Na'īmā, one is struck by the lack of integrity in the arguments proposed by the Qāḍī-zādelis. They very rightly recognised the weakness of their own arguments and consequently chose to resort to demagogy and Palace

---

83. Na'īmā, V, p. 268.

84. Na'īmā, V, p. 269.

intrigues. This is not to condemn their intellectual position, which within the framework of Islamic thought did possess a certain amount of validity, but rather to demonstrate that their tactics were opportunist and violated the unwritten rules of propriety within the Ottoman state.

The behaviour of the Ṣūfīs during this period provides a sharp contrast. Their dignity and restraint must have impressed both intellectuals and the populace in general.

The Palace and the Qāḍī-zādelis

The good relationship between the Palace and Qāḍī-zādelis was significant in that it helped recruitment of followers from among some employees of the Palace, such as bostāncılar (gardeners) and kapıcılar (gate men), most of whom had no formal religious training and were therefore easily swayed by the eloquent sermons of Qāḍī-zāde and his disciples. These Palace servants played a crucial role in the development of the relationship between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the court following the death of Sulṭān Murād IV (1640). Sulṭān İbrāhīm, who succeeded Murād IV, was not able to maintain the authority which he had inherited, and the reins of real power passed therefore into the hands of the Wālide Sulṭān and aghas who were in direct daily contact with the Palace servants. Through these Palace supporters of theirs, the Qāḍī-zādelis became an important group in the Palace, where they were able to take advantage of the weakness of the central authority in the realization of their aims.[85]

The period which begins with the death of Sulṭān

---

85. Na'īmā, IV, pp. 35-7, 243-4, 290-2; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., pp. 228, 231; Shaw, Empire, pp. 200-5; also A. Refiq, Samūr Dewri (1049-1059) (İstanbul, 1927); idem, Osmanlı Devrinde Hoca Nüfuzu, (İstanbul, 1933) and Qadınlar saltanatı (1049-1059) (İstanbul, 1927), 3 vols.

Murād in 1049/1640 and continued down until the early years of the reign of Meḥmed IV (1648-1687) may be considered as the period which marks the zenith of success for the Qāḍī-zādelis, who at this time acquired power and the material advantages that go with it. In sharp contrast to the Ṣūfīs' ethic of spirituality and asceticism, the Qāḍī-zādelis acquired and enjoyed influence and worldly prestige. Na'īmā summed up this contrast thus:

> The Qāḍī-zādelis acquired fame in the early days of His Majesty Sulṭān Meḥmed Khān, when the reins of management were in the hands of partners of the Sultanate. The reason for this was that the majority of the shaykhs of the dervish orders were not greedy for worldly goods and survived on the bare subsistence diet of qanā'at (contentment with one's lot) and did not know the necessary tricks and frauds for acquiring wealth. But the Qāḍī-zādelis made [the practice of] appearing in the guise of asceticism and piety a snare of falsification for the acquisition of worldly wealth. They gained control of the wicked usurers, the stock-piling charterers and the hypocritical and un-trustworthy members of the trading community. They accomplished any business that they had with the Pashas and Qāḍīs through the intercession [of intermediaries]. They devised tricks which would advance their desire of bringing to a successful conclusion their affairs concerning endowments (ewqāf) and [private] property. They would enter into agreements with contemptible rich people and employ those beasts in matters of clothes and furnishings, grains and other provisions.[86]

86. Na'īmā, VI, pp. 222-3.

If Na'īmā, as the only extant source which gives information on this period of the movement, is to be believed, it is very significant to note that the Qāḍī-zādelis, who were considered to be against bribery (<u>rüshwet</u>) as well as other uncanonical practices, had begun to compromise themselves. They had become involved in <u>rüshwet</u> gained illegal wealth and done business with people who were regarded as "beasts".

The coming of a new leader, Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed, gave a new spirit, direction and unity to the whole movement. The Qāḍī-zādelis became more militant, aggressive and intolerant towards their opponents. Üsṭüwānī's relationship with the Palace and his patronage by important people there played a significant role in the subsequent development of the Qāḍī-zādeli movement.

Through his influence over the Wālide Sulṭān and the <u>aghas</u> of the <u>Ḥarem</u>, Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed Efendi became powerful and influential in the Palace. According to Na'īmā, he was able to avail himself of the help of those who were close to the sovereign and thus came to have a hand in appointments and promotions. As a matter of fact, he and his supporters in the Palace or in the government controlled almost all appointments and dismissals in government posts.[87] It may be assumed that those who did not want to lose their position collaborated with the Qāḍī-zādelis and held a tolerant and flexible

87. Na'īmā, VI, p. 223.

attitude towards them. Because they were in charge of appointments, the Qāḍī-zādelis became very rich, since they used to offer offices to the highest bidder and to people who would support them. Moreover, through secret communications with court favourites, Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed offered advice on all measures of a governmental or religious nature. He would pronounce on whether a measure was or was not in the interest of religion and the state, and his opinions were usually accepted.[88] He therefore became so powerful and influential that no one would dare to stand against him. This kind of influence was apparently enjoyed by Üsṭüwānī for a number of years. It is clear from his account that Na'īmā is fierce in his condemnation of the pursuit and abuse of power by Üsṭüwānī and the Qāḍī-zādelis and he misses no opportunity to point out the corruption practised by this group.[89]

However, this period of influence, power and wealth enjoyed by the Qāḍī-zādelis received its first setback when the "Čınar waq'ası" (Čınar event) took place on 8 Jam. I . 1066 /4 March 1656. On this occasion, the Janissaries and sipāhīs jointly demanded the heads of thirty court and government officials;

whom they accused of corruption and in particular of debasing the coinage to such an extent that it was no longer accepted by the merchants of the

---

88. Na'īmā, V, pp. 57-8.

89. Na'īmā, VI, pp. 223-4; V, pp. 57-8.

city. This upheaval continued for five days, during which most of those who were on the list were hanged, each one from a plane tree in front of the Sulṭān Aḥmad Mosque. The shopkeepers closed their shops and stayed at home in support of the soldiers.[90]

As a result of this event it appears that the Qāḍī-zādelis lost most of their protectors and close friends in the Palace. Although their influence and power in the Palace and among the government officials was much reduced, they still held some control over the designation of posts and offices.[91] The main objective of the Čınar waq'ası was to prevent a particular group of people from using state funds for the benefit of themselves or their close friends and relatives. It is useful to glance at the names of those who were hanged at that time; these included the Agha of Dār al-Sa'āda, Behrām; the tutor of the Sulṭān, Bilāl Agha; the chief Agha of the Khāṣṣ Oda and the Defterdār (treasurer), as well as certain officials in the department of customs and ports.[92] As pointed out previously, the Qāḍī-zādelis

---

90. This event is very important in that it shows the weakness of the Palace and the power of the soldiers. Details in Na'īmā, VI, pp. 148-54; M. Nūrī, Netāyij al-Wuqū'āt (İstanbul, 1327), II, pp. 66-7; Danişmend, Kronoloji, III, pp. 420-1.
91. Cf. the comment by the new Grand Vizier on this question, quoted on the next page.
92. For more detail see M. Nūrī, op. cit., p. 67; Uzunçarşılı, OT, p. 299.

were influential with these people in the Palace, and at the same time they were closely associated with those officials who were responsible for customs and ports. So it is not too fanciful to draw the conclusion that the revolt had been primarily directed against the supporters of the Qāḍī-zādelis in the Palace, and indirectly therefore at the Qāḍī-zādelis themselves.

Another important event which contributed to the Qāḍī-zādelis' loss of power in the court was the appointment of a new Grand Vizier, Boynı Yaralı (Yassı) Meḥmed Pasha, on 26 Rajab 1066/26 April 1656.[93] The new Grand Vizier was a tough man by nature, and he seemed determined to re-establish law and order. Having realized the internal politics in the Palace, his first move was to take all power into his hands. He is reported by Na'īmā to have said:

> "What is the use of consulting the <u>'ulamā'</u> and the shaykhs about appointments and promotions?"

Na'īmā goes on to say that the new Grand Vizier began receiving bribes instead.[94]

Of course, as might be expected, the Qāḍī -zādelis became frustrated at this set-back. They did not accept easily their loss of power and influence in the Palace, and they embarked upon a vigorous but futile campaign against the Grand Vizier, whom they accused of bribery and

---

93. Danişmend, <u>op. cit.</u>, V, p. 42.

94. Na'īmā, <u>op.</u> and <u>loc. cit.</u>

corruption as well as protecting the Ṣūfīs.[95]

It is interesting to note that the nature of the movement had undergone a fundamental change by this time. Under Qāḍī-zāde the Qāḍī-zādelis had denounced all corruption and looked for a complete and general reformation of ethical attitudes. Under Üsṭüwānī the movement became a mere interest group vying for power and ready to exploit it for whatever material gain it could bring.

The relationship between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Palace and the trading classes is well described by Na'īmā, who quotes a statement by a certain Ḥanafī Ef., who supported the Ṣūfīs and was against the Qāḍī-zādelis, at a meeting where several prominent 'ulamā' were present like Muṣṭafā Efendi of Bolu and Minqarī-zāde. Ḥanafī Efendi compared the Qāḍī-zādelis to a great shady tree with branches everywhere. One branch was the bostāncıs in the Palace, one branch reached from the balṭacıs all the way to the Imperial Palace, and the third and greatest branch was the people of trades in the bazaar. Na'īmā reports Ḥanafī Efendi to have continued thus:

> "They do not listen to good advice and do not understand kind treatment; how are we going to get rid of them?"
>
> Muṣṭafā Efendi of Bolu joined in the conversation and said: "Friends, among the men of God the 'sword of the hidden' is well-known. If you were to turn to it for your revenge...."

95. Ibid.

Ghafūr Efendi, who was listening to the conversation, raised his head and said: "My lord, we say that it should be sufficient for us to order what is obvious; otherwise, if it is left to the ahwāl-i bātıniyya, God the Overpowering, Glorified and Exalted is the great Avenger," and completed his talk by quoting the Qur'ānic verse:

"And fear tumult or oppression, which
affecteth not particular [only] those
of you who do wrong:
And know that God is strict in punishment."
(8/25) [96]

This quotation appears to describe very aptly the Qādī-zādelis and their area of influence at this stage of the movement.

As well as stressing the stranglehold of the Qādī-zādelis on the Palace at that time, this account by Na'īmā is very revealing in its obvious insistence on the feelings of disapproval held by some of the 'ulamā' at least towards the Qādī-zāde movement.

Although Köprülü Mehmed Pasha brought an end to the influence and power of the Qādī-zādelis in the Palace in 1656, the movement was to be revived, as will be seen in the next chapter, by Wānī Mehmed.

---

96. Na'īmā, VI, p. 230.

The End of the Second Phase of the Qāḍī-zāde Movement

The most dangerous threat to the Qāḍī-zādelis lay in a reversal of their influence in the Palace, and with the appointment of Boynı Yaralı Meḥmed Pasha as Grand Vizier (1066/1656)[97] this dreaded possibility was realized. The Qāḍī-zādelis were not long in assessing the danger of their own position. They immediately embarked upon a campaign to discredit the new Grand Vizier. Again they used the pulpit as a forum for their attacks, but on this occasion their target was not the Ṣūfīs but the Grand Vizier himself.[98] This action must have been considered a gross violation of political propriety, for the Ottoman government was traditionally held to be immune from criticism. Opposition of this kind was tantamount to open rebellion. We can only presume that the Qāḍī-zādelis were encouraged in their attacks by the residual strength of their support in the Palace.

Ottoman military reverses in the naval war with Venice provided the Qāḍī-zādelis with an opportunity to level serious criticism against the Vizier. The Venetians captured the Bozcaada (İrenedos) and Limni (Limnos) just outside the Dardanelles in 1656.[99] Later in the

---

97. Danişmend, Kronoloji, III, p. 421.

98. Uzunçarşılı, OT, III, part I, 372; Na'īmā, VI, p. 224.

99. Danişmend, op. and loc. cit.

same year they even blocked the Dardanelles, a move which threatened the position of the capital. This created panic and fear in Istanbul.[100] Following this incident, The Qāḍī-zādelis exploited the situation for their own ends by blaming the administration,whom they held responsible for the defeat. In their sermons against the government, the Qāḍī-zādelis presented themselves as the champions of religion, the implication being that true religion rendered the state strong against the enemy. Now, as during the time of Qāḍī-zāde, their attacks focussed on the corruption, bribery and immorality of government officials, who, they claimed, patronised the Ṣūfīs. They struggled to create the impression that they were the only group interested in the defence of the shari'a and its principles. Na'īmā summarises the argument they presented:

> "Unjust and bribe-taking men are abundant, the noble shari'a is not being applied, the Muslim countries have become full of innovations. The Vizier[101] and the müftī [Shaykh al-Islām] are protecting the Ṣūfī innovators."[102]

It is apparent that the Qāḍī-zādelis were using the Ṣūfīs as a scapegoat in their criticisms of the administration

---

100. Kunt, op. cit., p. 20.

101. This almost certainly refers to the Grand Vizier of the time.

102. Na'īmā, VI, p. 224.

and the government. In doing this they had two aims: the first was to criticize the government indirectly, the second to discredit the Ṣūfīs and present them as being responsible for all the troubles and problems.

The government situation worsened when the Grand Vizier showed himself unable to handle the affairs of the state. The Sulṭān's confidence in his minister was shaken and as a result of the exorbitant demands of the Grand Vizier at a council meeting held in September 1656, the Sulṭān decided to dismiss him from his office. On the recommendation of the Wālide Turkhān Sulṭān, the Sulṭān eventually appointed Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha to the Grand Vizierate on 26 Dhī'l-qa'de 1065/15 September 1656.[103]

This new appointment, it appears, pleased the Qāḍī-zādelis, who must have assumed that they could now carry on their activities as usual and attain their previous power and influence. But the events which followed did not favour the Qāḍī-zādelis. They resumed their activities eight days after the appointment of Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha on Friday 3 Dhī'l-ḥijja 1066/22 September 1656. During the Friday prayer in the mosque of Meḥmed Fātiḥ, a group of

103. Kunt, op. cit., pp. 50-61; idem, "Na'īmā, Köprülü and the Grand Vezirate" in Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi, (İstanbul, 1973), I, pp. 57-64; Danişmend, Kronoloji, V, 42; Na'īmā, VI, pp. 213-4.

Qāḍī-zādelis openly objected to the mü'edhdhins chanting with taghannī the salāt wa salām (blessing and peace upon the Prophet), and demanded that this practice should be forbidden. However, an opposition group attempted to stop the Qāḍī-zādelis from interfering with the mü'edhdhins' performance. The ensuing struggle almost ended in bloodshed.

Naturally the Qāḍī-zādelis were angered by the opposition which their actions had provoked, and determined on a renewal of their campaign against the Ṣūfīs. After the prayer, they openly proposed a final campaign against the Ṣūfīs in which they envisaged the demolition of all the tekkes throughout Ottoman territory. The debris of these tekkes should then be cast into the sea. They therefore made an appeal to arms, inviting a violent take-over of the dervish lodges. Accordingly they made a public announcement saying:

> "Anyone who is a member of the umma of Muhammad, take up your tools and instruments of war in order to make 'al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar', and gather at the courtyard of the above-mentioned mosque tomorrow."104

Na'īmā represents the Qāḍī-zādelis as having, at this point three principal aims:

1. To go to the Sulṭān to obtain his permission to abolish all the bid'as (innovations) which had appeared since the time of the Prophet.

---

104. Na'īmā, VI, p. 225.

2. To demolish all tekkes, to call upon the dervishes in the streets of Istanbul to renew their faith and to kill them if they refused.

3. To demolish all the minarets of the Sulṭāns' mosques save one.[105]

This was nothing less than a call for a complete reform of religious attitudes within the Ottoman state. It is difficult to assess exactly what motives lay behind this manifesto. The Ṣūfīs are obviously under attack here, as their tekkes are specifically mentioned. The Qāḍī-zādelis may also, however, have been aiming their attacks at the Ottoman state itself, although they themselves may not at this time have been aware of all the implications of a policy which rejected all bid'as since the time of the Prophet.

The night of the Qāḍī-zādelis' proclamation was marked by unease and restlessness associated with the gathering storms about to unleash their fury on the city. Na'īmā describes the night as follows:

> "That night this clamour spread throughout the city of Istanbul. [On the one hand] the medrese students, with stout sticks and Kurdish war knives, and [on the other hand] the henchmen of Ḥājī Mandāl and Faqī Dongel, members of the class of stock-piling hypocritical traders and craftsmen, girding weapons on to خوطمان قراق قاقاونلر (?) , who were their apprentices and slaves, gathered in groups and began assembling

105. Idem, VI, p. 225.

in the Sulṭān Meḥmed [Fātiḥ] Mosque under the rallying cry (lit. 'in the form of') 'Let us go [and fight] for the cause of the faith!'"[106]

The Qāḍī-zādelis assembled at the mosque at the appointed time. The Grand Vizier of the time, Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha, who had been in the office for eight days, was informed of the situation, immediately took the initiative and advised them at first to avoid a violent incident and to withdraw their proclamation. The Qāḍī-zādelis did not, however, heed his warning. They must have realized that this was a crucial opportunity to achieve their mission, and therefore, predictably, they refused to abandon their attack. The Grand Vizier, Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha, thereupon summoned the 'ulamā' and asked their opinion on the subject. The 'ulamā' agreed on the illegitimacy of the Qāḍī-zādelis action and also stated that the claims of the Qāḍī-zādelis were false. It was held that their action would only result in civil strife. It was therefore decided that those who incited fitna must be punished in accordance with the Sharī'a. After this fatwā from the 'ulamā', Köprülü informed the Sulṭān; he ordered the Grand Vizier to have the guilty parties killed. The leaders of the Qāḍī-zādelis were however saved from execution by the Grand Vizier, who pleaded for their exile. Accordingly, the leader and instigator Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed, and also two other famous preachers, Türk Aḥmad and Dīwāne Muṣṭafā, were taken

106. Na'īmā, VI, p. 226.

from their houses and exiled to Cyprus (1656).[107] This action deprived the Qāḍī-zāde movement of leadership, and as a result the Qāḍī-zādelis were unable to influence affairs of state until the arrival of Wānī Meḥmed Ef. in Istanbul from Erzurum around the year 1662.

---

107. Na'īmā, VI, p. 226; Shaw, Empire, p. 209; Thomas, op. cit., p. 108; Şimşek, op. cit., p. 61.

CHAPTER VI

THE QĀḌĪ-ZADE MOVEMENT : THE THIRD PHASE

The Third Phase of the Movement

It appears that the exile of the three prominent leaders of the Qāḍī-zādelis to Cyprus by order of Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha, who was the Grand Vizier in 1656, as a result of their preparation for a final assault upon the Ṣūfīs, has been considered by some scholars as the annihilation of the Qāḍī-zāde movement.[1] In fact, the period immediately preceding this event marked the heyday of the Qāḍī-zādelis but the exile was only the end of the second phase in the development of the movement. It was not, however, the end of the story.

It is rather unfortunate that there is little information on the activities of the Qāḍī-zādelis after the exile of their leaders, nor are any facts known about those who were exiled. It is very unlikely that Köprülü was satisfied with the exile of those three and the confiscation of the properties of the Qāḍī-zādelis.[2] He may well have taken more tough action against the Qāḍī-zādelis and their supporters in Istanbul in order to avoid further conflicts and disorder. It is certain that Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha, in order to destroy the roots of disorder and rebellions, was ready to take any course of action, which would include the Qāḍī-zādelis and their supporters in the government and at the court. When

---

1. Authors like İnalcık, Shaw and Uzunçarşılı.
2. Shaw, op. cit., p. 209.

four thousand persons, including several influential Ṣūfīs, were executed by the order of Köprülü, it is not impossible that there were some amongst them from the ranks of the Qāḍī-zādelis.[3]

Concerning the three leaders, Üsṭüwānī, Türk Aḥmad and Dīwāne Muṣṭafā, we only know that Üsṭüwānī, after staying a while in Cyprus, was ordered to return to his home town, Damascus. He went back there and continued his struggle against religious innovations until his death.[4] But nothing is known about the other two. Did they stay in Cyprus or return? If they stayed, did they carry on their struggle against the Ṣūfīs or not? If they had the chance to return to the capital, what happened to them after that? These and other similar questions cannot be answered in our present state of knowledge.

The reason for the quiescence of the Qāḍī-zādelis may well be found in the action of the Grand Vizier against the Ṣūfīs. It appears from the sources that Köprülü Meḥmed in fact did not treat the Ṣūfīs differently from the Qāḍī-zādelis. Perhaps he did not want to give any chance to the Ṣūfīs to feel the victory over their opponents, whilst at the same time he wished to create the impression that the Grand Vizier would not tolerate

---

3. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans (Oxford, 1929), II, p. 421.
4. Cf. pp. 224-5; also ʿUshāqī-zāde, p. 553.

any group who were involved in disorder. So he suppressed both parties. It has already been pointed out that he killed several Ṣūfīs but he also particularly prohibited the ceremonies and rituals of dervish orders, such as the Khalwatiyya, Mawlawiyya and Shamsiyya.[5] T. Smith, an English traveller who was visiting Istanbul at that time, after describing Köprülü's tough measures against disorder and rebellions, makes the following observation concerning the Ṣūfīs.

> "This man [referring to Köprülü] also forbade the dervishes to dance in a ring and turn round, which before was their solemn practice at set times before the people."[6]

It is possible that, because the Qāḍī-zādelis witnessed these prohibitions and the executions of the Ṣūfīs by the state, they did not want to make themselves conspicuous for a while. Köprülü's tough policy against anarchy and revolt from whatever source was felt throughout the state and continued until his death.[7] It was his merciless and harsh actions which caused him to be called bloodthirsty by some of the Ottoman historians.[8]

---

5. Ubicini, Letters, I, 103 ; Hasluck, op. cit., p. 422.
6. T. Smith in J. Ray's A Collection of Curious Travels and Voyages (London, 1738), 2nd edition, II, p. 384.
7. Hasluck, op. cit., p. 422.
8. T. Gökbilgin -R.C.Repp, "Köprülüler" in EI², V, p. 258.

Following his death in 1661, his son Köprülü Fāḍıl succeeded him in the office. His policies were no different from his father's. In this respect Hasluck writes as follows:

> "In the vizirate of the younger Kuprulu, Ahmad, who followed his father's policy, [there] appeared an important ally in Vanī Efendi, a persuasive preacher of the strictest Sunni principles, who obtained a great influence over the orthodox Sulṭān. As a member of the Ulama party, Vanī was the determined foe of the dervish orders, always suspected of heresy by the stricter Musulmans. His activity, which seems to date from 1664, was the religious counterpart of the political measures of the Kuprulus; he opposed lawlessness in religion as they in politics. A strict Puritan, he made a strong stand against the mystic Ṣūfī doctrines professed by many members of the upper classes and the cult of saints and other superstitions in vogue among the lower." 9

After an interval of eight years the Qāḍī-zādelis in the court and city met another preacher, Wānī Meḥmed Efendi, who after establishing himself in Istanbul became the advocator of the ideas which were defended by the Qāḍī-zādelis. As a matter of fact Wānī's arrival in Istanbul marked the beginning of the third phase in the movement of the Qāḍī-zādelis.

In the third phase of the movement the Qāḍī-zādelis maintained some of their struggle against the Ṣūfīs

---

9. Hasluck, op. cit., II, pp. 422-3.

through the government. Wānī, as will be seen below, was clever enough to take the Sulṭān and the Grand Vizier into his hands and employ their power and influence in the cause of the Qāḍī-zādelis. Against his growing power and influence the Ṣūfīs could not resist, except a militant like Niyāzī al-Miṣrī, who outspokenly defended Ṣūfī practices and beliefs though spending most of his life in exile or prison.

Wānī Meḥmed Efendi (? -1096/1685)

Wānī's Life

Al-Shaykh Meḥmed al-Wānī b. Shaykh Bistām Ef., commonly known as Wānī Meḥmed Ef., was born in Hashāb, a small town in the wilāyet of Wān (Van). Unfortunately, we have no information available to us regarding his date of birth and family.[10]

According to ʻUshāqī-zāde, he received his early education at home from his father and then, in order to advance his studies, he travelled to the city of Wān where he read several Islamic sciences under different tutors. Having finished his studies there, Meḥmed Ef. set out for Tabrīz. It is recorded that when he arrived there he did not want to remain because of the existence there of certain non-Islamic communities, such as the

---

10. The biographical sources on his life are: ʻUshāqī-zāde, pp. 563-9; OM, II, p. 50; Sh. Sāmī, Qāmūs al-Aʻlām (İstanbul, 1336), VI, pp. 461-2; İ.H. Danişmend, Türklük Meseleleri (İstanbul, 1966), pp. 67-93; İ. Parmaksızoğlu, "Mehmed Ef. Vānī-zāde" in Türk Ansiklopedisi (Ankara, 1976), XXIII, pp. 407-8. Parmaksızoğlu, contrary to ʻUshāqī-zāde and OM, states that Üsṭüwānī was born in the city of Wān; he gives no source for this information.

Rafīḍīs, Manichees and Zoroastrians. He therefore proceeded to Qarabāgh where he spent ten years under the guidance of a certain Molla Nūr al-Dīn about whom we have no information. Presumably it was during this period that he acquired an interest in Ṣūfism and engaged himself sometimes in its practices and in the study of some of the accepted classical works on the subject.[11]

Having completed his studies, Wānī Ef. came to Erzurum, where he settled down. Here he began preaching in the mosques and presiding over study circles in order to "guide people to the right path." Through teaching and preaching he gained fame and reputation.

While Köprülü Fāḍıl Aḥmad Pasha was resident in Erzurum in 1069/1658, he heard of the fame and reputation of Meḥmed Ef. and arranged a meeting with him, as a result of which there arose a relationship between the preacher and the future Grand Vizier. When Fāḍıl Aḥmad Pasha left Erzurum for the governorship of Damascus[12] in 1070/1659, this friendship continued. Thus, when Meḥmed Ef. encountered some opposition to his teaching from the

---

11. In his risāla, Muḥyi'l-sunna (fol. 3b), he mentions that until he reached middle age, he engaged in Ṣūfī practices and studied the following books: Iḥyā' 'Ulūm of al-Ghazālī, 'Awārif al-Ma'ārif of Suhrawardī and Rashaḥāt-i 'Ayn al-Ḥayāt of Ḥüseyn Wā'iẓ Ṣafī.

12. T. Gökbilgin, "Köprülüler, Fāḍil Ahmet Pasha" in İA, VI, p. 898.

local shaykhs in Erzurum, he naturally sought the help of his friend and future patron Fāḍil Aḥmad Pasha, on whose suggestion he was invited to the capital by the Grand Vizier Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha. But it appears that Wānī Meḥmed, because of his engagements with teaching and preaching, could not make the journey until Fāḍıl Aḥmad Pasha succeeded his father as Grand Vizier. On the other hand, Muṣṭafā Luṭfī suggests that from Erzurum he came to Bursa, where he stayed for some time. From there he went to Istanbul in 1074/1663.[13] According to 'Ushāqī-zāde, on Wānī's arrival Fāḍıl Aḥmad Pasha was in Edirne, perhaps busy with preparations for the campaign against the Hapsburgs. Parmaksızoğlu suggests also that he was appointed as a preacher in the Yeñi Jāmi' in 1075/1664.[14] It seems that Wānī Meḥmed Ef. began delivering sermons in various mosques in Istanbul. According to the sources, his speech was eloquent and effective, and it is not surprising, therefore, that in a short time he acquired an enviable reputation and impressed Sulṭān Meḥmed IV, who once listened to one of his Friday sermons in the Sulṭān Meḥmed (Fātiḥ) Mosque.[15]

According to 'Ushāqī-zāde, his first appointment in

---

13. M. Luṭfī, <u>Tuḥfet al-'Aṣrī fī Menāqıb al-Miṣrī</u> (Bursa, 1309), pp. 34-5.
14. 'Ushāqī-zāde, p. 566; İ. Parmaksızoğlu, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 408.
15. 'Ushāqī-zāde, p. 567.

Istanbul was as a preacher in the Sulṭān Selīm Mosque, where he addressed a large congregation twice a week. No doubt his moving sermons won the admiration not only of the people but also of the Sulṭān. The fact that his patron, Fāḍıl Aḥmad Pasha, was Grand Vizier helped to advance Wānī Meḥmed in his career.[16]

The Sulṭān, who is credited by his biographers with an innocent, simple faith and great respect for religion and for religious matters,[17] showed his admiration for Wānī by visiting him in his house on 17 Rajab 1077/13 July 1666.[18] This rare event no doubt helped to promote the prestige of this preacher and henceforth he was known as Pādishāh sheykhi (the shaykh of the Sulṭān) and invited to deliver sermons twice a week in the Palace. Moreover, according to Rāshid, he was requested to hold study circles in the

---

16. C. Baysun suggests in his article on Meḥmed IV in İA, X, p. 556, that the Sulṭān was surrounded by the Qāḍī-zādelis and this certainly also helped to advance the career of Wānī Meḥmed Ef.

17. M. Khalīfa, Tārīkh-i Ghilmanī (İstanbul, 1340), p. 96.

18. M. Rāshid, Tārīkh-i Rāshid, (İstanbul, 1282), I, pp. 134-5.

Palace with his students. In order to accommodate the students three tents were pitched, and two meals a day were given to them from the Palace kitchen.[19] During this period the death of the Sulṭān's tutor, Emīn Čelebi,[20] occurred. This was an important post in the Palace and in the 'ilmiyye hierarchy, and it was now filled by Wānī Meḥmed Ef. According to Parmaksızoğlu, he was also appointed tutor to the Sulṭān's sons.[21]

The post provided a position from which he could influence the Sulṭān directly. He therefore began showing his disapproval of certain Ṣūfī practices, like samā' and dawarān and the visitation of tombs. These were forbidden by the Sulṭān, the former in 1077/1666 and the latter in 1078/1667.[22]

Wānī Meḥmed began to lose his popularity and influence after the death of his patron, the Grand Vizier Köprülü, in 1087/1676, but nevertheless he maintained a fair degree of influence and had become wealthy. He was appointed as

---

19. Ibid., p. 161.
20. Hammer (trs. 'Aṭā' Bey) (İstanbul, 1947), XI, p. 229.
21. İ. Parmaksızoğlu, op. cit., p. 408.
22. Thāqıb Dede, Sefīne-i Mawlawiyya (İstanbul, 1282), I, p. 180; M. Rāshid, Tārīkh, I, pp. 139-40; A. Gölpınarlı, Mevlānadan Sonra Mevlevilik (İstanbul, 1953), p. 167.

army preacher for the Vienna campaign in 1095/1683. Following the Ottoman failure at Vienna, he was dismissed from his post and sent to his farm in Kestel, near Bursa, where he died two years later on 13 Dhī'l-qa'de 1096/12 October 1685.[23]

---

23. Rāshid, _op._ and _loc. cit_; 'Ushāqī-zāde, p. 569.

Personal Qualities of Wānī

Wānī Meḥmed was to become the last leader of the Qāḍī-zādelis in their struggle with the Ṣūfīs. His arrival was to mark the beginning of a new phase in their continuing dispute, and his contribution in this area cannot be underestimated. His personal motives for renewing and encouraging the dispute are not known, but it would not be unjustified to presume that, like his predecessors, he was motivated by an appetite for fame and reputation in a society where he had no social standing. In this respect, indeed, he deserves particular attention in regard to his controversial character and personality,[24] for he had a basis of influence at the Ottoman court and among the officials of its administration.

Although Wānī Meḥmed played an important role in the Ottoman state for about two decades, it is unfortunate that information concerning his character is very scant and contradictory. Accordingly it is difficult to form a clear picture of this important personality.[25] One cannot doubt that he was a successful, effective and eloquent speaker, as this was the means by which he received important posts, as well as prestige, wealth and

24. M. Kara, Tekkeler, p. 76.

25. While Na'īmā narrates some stories concerning Wānī and suggests that he was a hypocrite (VI, p. 229), 'Ushāqī-zāde has much praise for him.

influence. In this respect he was in the mould of his predecessors. The patronage of Sulṭān Meḥmed IV and the Grand Vizier Köprülü Fāḍıl Aḥmad Pasha gave him enormous power and influence, while it discouraged his opponents.

The English traveller J. Covel, who saw Wānī and described him as "the great preacher amongst the Turks," made the following observations:

> "He is an old huncht-back man, very grey, a crabbed countenance, yet his shrivelled flesh is clear, not black or swarthy, but pale; and Nature hath marked him in the face, for his right eye is less than his left, as if it were shrunk."[26]

According to 'Ushāqī-zāde he was a pious and knowledgeable man, while Na'īmā presents him as a hypocrite and narrates some notorious stories.[27] Moreover, Şemseddīn Sāmī and Bursalı Ṭāhir are agreed that he was a fanatic. Danişmend considers Wānī Meḥmed an important figure among the nationalists, who not only opposed Ottoman cultural policies but composed a Qur'ānic commentary in order to defend the Turkish nation against some of the attacks of other commentators.[28]

---

26. Extracts from the Diaries of Dr. John Covel (1670-1679) in <u>Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant</u>, ed. T. Bent (London 1893), pp. 268-9.
27. Na'īmā, <u>Tārīkh</u>, VI, pp. 229-30.
28. İ.H. Danişmend, <u>Türklük Meseleleri</u>, p. 68;

    Gölpınarlı reports that the Ṣūfīs do not go to

The Works of Wānī

Wānī Meḥmed produced a few works in Arabic and Turkish; the important ones are:

1. 'Arā'is al-Qur'ān wa nafā'is al-Furqān. This is a commentary on the Qur'ān, written in Arabic in two volumes. Danişmend points out that the author takes the opportunity of advancing the position of the Turks against the defamation by the great commentators, such as Qāḍī Bayḍāwī (1286) who postulated that "the Gog and Magog (people were Turks)."[29]

2. Muḥyi'l-sunna wa mumīt al-bid'a.[30] This is written in Arabic, Turkish and Persian and is his most important work, in which he presents his views on several issues which were controversial. It deals with the innovations which were practised among the Ṣūfīs in his own time. The author begins the work by warning his religious brothers

---

Vaniköy a village which was restored by Wānī Ef., because of his hostility towards the Ṣūfīs; see Mevlanadan Sonra Mevlevilik (İstanbul, 1953), p. 168

29. Wānī Meḥmed, 'Arā'is al-Qur'ān, Beyazıt Library, MS. no. 67; Süleymaniye Library, MS. Es'ad Ef. 2319;

30. İstanbul University Library, MS. Tyz. 6273. There are several other copies of this work, some of them under different names; see Bibliography.

against some Ṣūfī practices which he considers as novelties and uncanonical. He then mentions the books of the Ṣūfīs and the fuqahā' and relates how he personally attained the right path after mistakenly practising these innovations for some time.[31] The work is divided into five small chapters, in each of which the author discusses common innovations from his own viewpoint. In order to strengthen his position, he does not fail to quote from respected authorities such as Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzī, Bayḍāwī, Turtushī, and also the famous fatwā collections, like Tatarkhāniyya, Bezzāziyya and Qāḍīkhān.

The chapters in the work are as follows:

a) Bayān mā yadhkuru fī karāhata'l-dhikr jahran.
b) Fī ḥurumat al-daff wa'l raqṣ.
c) Bayān karahatu al-ṣalat al-raghā'ib wa'l-bar'a wa'l-qadr.
d) Bayān karahatu al-dhikr fī nashī.
e) Bayān karahatu al-muṣafāḥa fī ba'ḍ al-awqāt wa'l-mu'ānaqa wa'l-naẓar ilā'l-amr. Finally he mentions the use of tobacco which he considers unlawful.

3. Kashf al-maṭālib, in Arabic.[32]

---

31. Muḥyi'l-sunna wa mumīt al-bid'a, fol. 3a.
32. Millet Library, MS. 'Arabī, no. 2754.

4. Risāla mabda' al-ma'ād.[33]

5. A'māl al- yawm wa'l-Layl.[34]

6. Münshe'āt-ı Wānī. This is a collection of the letters by Wānī to some of the government officials, e.g. the Grand Vizier, the Shaykh al-Islām.[35]

33, 34. These two works are mentioned in OM, II, p. 50, but I was unable to trace them in MS. form.

35. İstanbul University Library, MS. F. 2114.

Wānī's Renewal of the Dispute

Wānī Meḥmed Ef. arrived in Istanbul several years after the clash between the Qāḍī-zādelis and their opponents in the Fātiḥ Mosque in 1656.[36] Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha, the Grand Vizier, as already mentioned above, had exiled the leaders of the Qāḍī-zādelis, who had provoked the masses against the Ṣūfīs, to Cyprus. At the same time, he also did not fail to punish the Ṣūfīs and he therefore destroyed some Ṣūfī orders, such as the Mawlawīs, the Khalwatis and the Shamsis , and settled the dispute which had flared up between the two most important religious groups of the time.[37]

Wānī Meḥmed, who enjoyed the protection of the new Grand Vizier, Köprülü Fāḍıl Aḥmad Pasha, had a good reception when he arrived in the capital from Bursa in 1074/1663.[38] Köprülü was an admirer and good friend of Wānī and it is clear that this friendship helped Wānī in his career and enabled him to attract the attention of Sulṭān Meḥmed IV, who even visited Wānī in his house.[39] There then followed his appointment as preacher to the Palace and later as tutor to the Sulṭān and the Sulṭān's

---

36. Wānī arrived in the capital in 1074/1663. See M. Lūṭfī, op. cit., p. 35.

37. Cf. chapter V.

38. M. Lūṭfī, op. cit., p. 34.

39. See p. 274, above.

sons. These signs of royal favour gave Wānī the opportunity to enjoy great influence and power in the Palace and among the *'ulamā'*.[40] Wānī's rise to power may be attributed to his great talents and to the high regard in which the Grand Vizier came to hold him. In this respect Hasluck writes as follows:

> "In the vizirate of the younger Kuprulu, Ahmed, who followed his father's policy, appeared an important ally in Vanī Efendi, a persuasive preacher of the strictest Sunni principles, who obtained a great influence over the orthodox Sultan. As a member of the ulama party, Vani was a determined foe of the dervish orders, always suspected of heresy by the stricter Mussulmans."[41]

The young Sulṭān 's attitude to Wānī was one of affectionate admiration. The Sulṭān is described by his biographers as a man of simple faith, good-hearted and sensitive in religious matters. He was soon won over by the experienced Wānī. It is said that the Sulṭān even used to take Wānī with him wherever he went.[42]

Certain specific activities added to Wānī's growing prestige and influence and are worthy of further analysis

---

40. *Ibid.*

41. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam Under the Sultans*, (Oxford, 1929), II, p. 422.

42. Baysun, *op. cit.*, p. 556.

here. Firstly, Wānī was concerned with trying to convert some of the Ottoman Jews to Islām. More especially, when Sabbatai Savi agreed to be a Muslim and adopted a Muslim name, the credit for this was given to Wānī.[43] Sabbatai Savi (1626-1676) claimed to be the Jewish Messiah and tried to win over the Ottoman Jews in general and the Jews of İzmir and Salonik in particular. In fact he even attempted to incite them to rebel against the Ottomans. He was opposed, however, by some of the Jews themselves, who complained to the authorities, and he was arrested. He became aware of the fact that he was likely to receive the death penalty. As the only alternative open to him, he declared his allegiance to Islam in the presence of the Shaykh al-Islām and Wānī on 24 Dhī'l-qa'de 1077/24 September 1666 in Edirne.[44]

According to Hammer, it was Wānī Meḥmed who also played the major role in the prohibition of alcohol and the destruction of taverns in the capital and other cities on I Rabı' 1081/19 July 1670.

---

43. Ubicini, op. cit., II, pp. 347-50.

44. Ibid. See also G. Scholem, Sabbatai Ṣevi, The Mystical Messiah (1626-1676), (London, 1973); Kāmil Pasha, Tārīkh-i siyāsī-yi dewlet-i āliye-i 'Othmāniyye (İstanbul, 1327), II, p. 103; Gibb-Bowen, ii, pp. 241-2.
On another occasion Wānī held a discussion with Panayoti, who was a Greek by origin and acted as a

Wānī took full advantage of his growing power to begin an attack[45] on the Ṣūfīs and their practices. Having been a Ṣūfī for some time in his early life, he knew the Ṣūfīs and their practices well.[46] He therefore first turned his disapproving eye on the Ṣūfī performance of sama' and dawarān. In his view, the Ṣūfīs were the worst kind of infidels, and such practices as these were sinful innovations and even ḥarām. Deriving full benefit from his influence over the Sulṭān, Wānī succeeded in persuading him of the illegality of performances of sama' and dawarān conducted by the Mawlawīs and the Khalwatīs.

---

translator to the Dīwān. The discussion took place in 1669 in the presence of the Grand Vizier Köprülü and other prominent 'ulamā'. Wānī Meḥmed could not, however, produce convincing enough arguments for Panayoti, but he was at least seen to be active in matters of conversion. See Ubicini, II, pp. 52-3; Hammer, XI, p. 287.

45. Hammer, XI, p. 230; Rāshid, I, p. 250; Mehmed Agha, Silaḥdār Tārīkhi, I, p. 57; R.E. Koçu, Osmanlı Tarihinde Yasaklar (İstanbul, 1950), pp. 17-23; Kāmil Pasha, op. cit., II, p. 104; Hasluck, op. cit., p. 423.

46. Cf. above, p. 272.

Accordingly, these Ṣūfī practices were forbidden for the first time by a *fermān* of the Sulṭān in 1076/1666.[47]

This prohibition was a decisive moral victory for the Qāḍī-zādelis over the Ṣūfīs, and it represents the high point of the Qāḍī-zāde movement. For the first time, their hostility to the Ṣūfīs had resulted in official support for their view from the Sulṭān himself. Not surprisingly, the prohibition grieved the Ṣūfīs. If Thāqıb Dede is to be believed, thousands of Mawlawīs died of sorrow and grief or left for other places.[48] It would appear that the implications of the *fermān* affected other Ṣūfī practices, including *dhikr jahrī* and performing *tahlīl* and *tasbīḥ* while carrying the coffin of a dead Muslim. On occasion, this prohibition was even carried out by force. When the authorities saw or heard people carrying the coffin performing *dhikr* and *tahlīl*, they did not hesitate to stop the procession.[49] In addition to these activities,

---

47. Thāqıb Dede, *op. cit.*, I, p. 180. The dervishes called this prohibition "Yasaǧ-ī bed" 1077. This prohibition was lifted one year before the death of Wānī in 1684. See Gölpınarlı, *Mevlevilik*, p. 168.

48. Thāqıb Dede, *op.* and *loc. cit.*

49. A Ṣūfī manuscript by Shaykh ʿAbd al-Laṭīf b. M. Esʿad writing about the life and miracles of his grandfather al-Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ghazzi who lived in Bursa during the reign of Meḥmed IV and met with Wānī after his

Hasluck adds that "He banished the Khalwati dervish Sheikh Misri of Bursa and the Kadri Karabash Ali of Skutari, and condemned the mystic poets of his time."[50]

It is difficult to assess the efficacy of this prohibition. It is known that certain Ṣūfī leaders, such as Ashrāf-zāde Seyyid Sharaf al-Dīn Khalwatī and Niyāzī al-Miṣrī in Bursa and a Qādirī Shaykh in Edirne did not abide by the fermān.[51]

Following this prohibition, in fact, the Ṣūfīs' reaction found its full expression in the activities of the famous, militant Khalwatī Ṣūfī, Niyāzī al-Miṣrī (1617-1694), who had already held some discussions with Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed Ef. on tobacco-smoking and coffee-drinking before the arrival of Wānī Meḥmed.[52] He distinguished himself by a militant devotion to Shī'ite beliefs and he even went as far as claiming the prophethood of the

---

dismissal. The MS. is dated 1297. I specially thank Shaykh Muzaffar Ozak for his kindness and generosity.

50. Hasluck, op. cit., II, p. 423.

51. M. Lüṭfī, Tuhfat al-'Aṣri fī Menāqıb al-Miṣrī (Bursa, 1309), pp. 34-5.

52. I. Glock, Niyāzī al-Miṣrī, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Bonn, 1951, pp. 30-34; A. Gölpınarlı, "Niyāzī-i Miṣri" in Şarkiyat Mecmuası, VII (İstanbul, 1972), pp. 183-229.

grandsons of the Prophet, Ḥasan and Ḥüseyn. Furthermore, he declared himself to be a prophet and the Mahdī.[53]

In his writings and sermons Niyāzī expressed his objections to the negative attitude of the Ottoman government and its officials towards the Ṣūfīs. This he blamed to a large extent on the influence of Wānī. Accordingly, he declared the Ottoman Sulṭāns and officials as well as Wānī to be Hamzawīs,[54] whom he hated and criticised severely. It is reported that in one of his sermons he said: "In making dhikr do not be like Wānī."[55]

The year after the prohibition of samāʿ and dawarān (i.e. 1077/1667), natural disasters struck various parts of the Ottoman state. Plague broke out in Istanbul and cost the lives of many scholars. Such events appear to have given Wānī the opportunity to strike a strong blow

---

53. Gölpınarlı, op. and loc. cit.
54. Hamzawīs: those who followed the path of Shaykh Hamza Bosnawī, who was executed in the sixteenth century, cf. chapter III. Thereafter they did not follow any particular shaykh, nor did they have their own special rituals like other dervish orders; see Gölpınarlı, Melāmilik, pp. 45, 69, 72; T. Okiç, "Hamzavilere ait vesikalar" in Precedings of International Congress of the Orientalists, (İstanbul, 1952).
55. M. Luṭfī, op. cit., p. 34.

against the Ṣūfīs. He presented these disasters as the manifestation of Divine displeasure at the unorthodox practices which were widespread in Ottoman society.[56] Such practices included the visitation and veneration of the tomb of a certain Qanber Baba,[57] who, according to Gölpınarlı, was considered a saint and visited by the masses near Edirne at Baba ʻAtīq.[58] According to Hasluck, the _tekke_ of Qanbur (_sic_) Dede was evidently an important place of pilgrimage in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[59] Wānī suggested that seeking the intercession of saints was tantamount to the sin of _shirk_, and requested the demolition of the tomb. The governor of Edirne was forced to obey an imperial edict on 14 Rebīʻ II 1078/ 3 September 1667.[60] By a further decree of Sulṭān Meḥmed IV, the visitation of tombs, apparently for the first time in in Ottoman history, was officially forbidden.[61] This

---

56. Gölpınarlı, _Mevlevilik_, p. 167.
57. Rāshid, _op. cit._, I, pp. 139-40.
58. Hasluck, _Christianity and Islam Under the Sultans_ (Oxford, 1929), I, p. 55.
59. _Ibid_; Hasluck uses the title _Dede_ rather than _Baba_. In Rāshid it is given as Baba. It is not uncommon for Bektāshīs to use these terms in the same sense.
60. _Ibid_; also see vol. II, pp. 422-4.
61. Rāshid, _op._ and _loc. cit._

represents the peak of Wānī's influence over the Sulṭān and the government alike.

It appears that Wānī did not stop his anti-Ṣūfī activities even after his dismissal from office after the siege of Vienna in 1683. The following episode is a strong indication of Wānī's continuing determination to pursue his anti-Ṣūfī activities. It is reported only by the author of the life and miracles of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ghazzī.[62] After Wānī had been dismissed, he went to his farm in Kestel, near Bursa.[63] In spite of his withdrawal from public life, he was still regarded as the governor and owner of Bursa.[64] At that time Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ghazzī had a large following in the city. Sometime between 1683 and his death two years later Wānī made some complaints to the capital about the Shaykh and his beliefs. According to Wānī, al-Ghazzī approved of Niyāzī al-Miṣrī's false ideas, such as the prophethood of the imāms Ḥasan and Ḥüsayn. Ideas such as these would lead people astray and corrupt their faith.[65]

Following the complaint, an order was sent to the Qāḍī of Bursa to set up a court and examine the validity of the allegations made by Wānī. So, Shaykh al-Ghazzī, Wānī and

---

62. See note 49, above.

63. Evliya Çelebi, Seyahatname (İstanbul, 1935), IX, 10.

64. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, op. cit., fol. 117a.

65. Ibid.

other available 'ulamā' in Bursa were invited to the court. The reason for this court being convened was made known by reading out the order which had come from Istanbul. It was demanded therein that the beliefs of Shaykh al-Ghazzī should conform to the sharī'a and to orthodoxy and that they should not lead the people astray. If the shaykh was perverting the minds of the people, he must be stopped by the authorities.[66] Having heard the order and the allegations, Shaykh al-Ghazzī turned to the judge and said:

> "There are nearly ninety 'ālims in this courtroom, most of whom have been my students or students of my disciples. Ask them about my belief and its consistency or inconsistency with the sharī'a."[67]

Having heard the shaykh, the judge consulted the 'ulamā' in the room on the request. All of them said:

> "Everything that has been said is nothing but slander. We studied under his supervision and attended his study circles and we have not heard from him anything which is contradictory to the sharī'a. We all of us studied orthodox belief from him. We all bear witness to his sound belief, not only in this world but also in the hereafter."[68]

Having heard the declaration of the 'ulamā', al-Ghazzī

---

66. Fol. 118.
67. Fol. 119.
68. Fol. 120.

left the court-room at once. Sometime after this event a group of soldiers, whom the author describes as mad (deli), sympathetic to the Shaykh al-Ghazzī, raided the house of Wānī in Kestel, and murdered the people there.[69] They did not find Wānī himself, who was away from home at a place called Qara Bikār. The soldiers finally captured him there and tied his hands behind his back. Later, they decided to take him to Edirne, to have their case settled in the imperial court. On their way to Edirne, they realized that the Sulṭān and Grand Vizier were friends of Wānī and would no doubt save him from their hands. So they decided to kill him then and there. This they did. Wānī's murderers were never brought to justice.[70]

It is difficult to know how much reliance may be placed on the information in the work by Shaykh ʻAbd al-Laṭīf, on which the above account is entirely based. The narrative clearly demonstrates, however, the level of hostility

---

69. Fol. 121.

70. Fols. 122-123a. The other sources do not mention this event at all. ʻAbd al-Laṭīf's motive in narrating this story here is in fact to present Wānī's death as one of his shaykh's "overpowering miracles" (kerāmāt-ı qahire). Neither ʻUshaqī-zāde, nor OM and also, Parmaksizoğlu speak about this event.

between the Ṣūfīs and the Qāḍī-zādelis during the life-time of Wānī. Of course, this enmity did not come to an end with his death. His death only ended yet another phase in the protracted struggle between the two major religious groups in Islamic society.

Through his influence and activities, Wānī Meḥmed renewed the dispute which had been temporarily suppressed by the banishment of the Qāḍī-zādeli leaders in 1656. Wānī's motivation in reviving the old hostilities is difficult to discern. No doubt a genuine desire to stamp out innovations drove him to attack the Ṣūfīs, but his own ambitions are also clearly visible. The very fact, however, that he appears to have continued in his long fight against the Ṣūfīs, even in political retirement, is a strong indication of his firm dedication to the Qāḍī-zādelis' cause.

The Influence of the Qāḍī-zāde Movement

Although the last leader of the Qāḍī-zādelis, Wānī Meḥmed, died in 1685, it appears that the ideas of the movement continued to survive and manifest themselves in different parts of the Ottoman state.

Since the sources are silent in regard to the Qāḍī-zādelis' position in Istanbul after the dismissal of Wānī from his post, it is possible that they maintained their existence without showing any activity, that in time they lost their enthusiasm and eventually adopted a more tolerant attitude towards innovations. Alternatively, it is possible that they continued their struggle but not as an organised group and without applying the pressure and violence of the past.

On the other hand, an event which took place in Bursa eight years after the death of Wānī Meḥmed, in 1104/1692, is an indication of the survival of the ideas of the Qāḍī-zādelis and of continuing hatred between them and the Ṣūfīs.

According to Abd al-Laṭīf, on Laylat al-qadr in the month of Ramaḍān, in the great mosque of Bursa, when the congregation had completed the performance of the tarāwīḥ prayer,[71] the chief müedhdhin informed the jamā'a that they were going to offer twelve additional rek'ats for the Laylat al-qadr (ṣalāt-ı Laylat al-qadr). All together they

---

71. A special supererogatory prayer offered in congregation during the month of Ramaḍān.

began to pray. However, the fanatics (Muta'aṣṣıbān), who considered this prayer unlawful, had already decided to prevent the Ṣūfīs from performing it. Under the leadership of a preacher they had made the necessary preparations, by bringing weapons, such as knives, skewers (shish) and sticks into the mosque to use against the Ṣūfīs. When the congregation began the prayer, the fanatics tried to attract their attention. On failing to do this, they decided to launch their attack upon the imām, Dervish Süleymān. A certain Dervish Aḥmad, who was behind the imām, tried to protect the imām from being attacked, and he himself became the target. The attackers stabbed him with the skewers and knives and he soon died of the wounds they inflicted on him. The imām's life was saved, however.[72] According to Shaykh Luṭfī, the imām also was killed in this incident.[73]

Abd al-Laṭīf gives an account from Ṣūfī-zāde al-Ḥājj Aḥmad, who was next to Dervish Aḥmad when he fell dead on the floor. Ṣūfī-zāde narrates:

> "I was close to dervish Aḥmad. A sūkhte stepped on Dervish Aḥmad's chest, pressed upon the hilt of the knife and pushed it further with his foot. In the meantime he was shouting 'You perform namāz-ı Qadr in this way, now you have had your punishment.'
> Having witnessed this event, a Ṣūfī

72. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, op. cit., fols. 105a-106 .

73. M. Luṭfī, Tuḥfat al-ʿAṣrī fī Menāqıb al-Miṣrī, p. 34.

sympathizer threw a stone at this fanatic and killed him by breaking his head into pieces. The fight spread and intensified, some of the people left the mosque but the remaining group continued until the arrival of the city governor and chief judge, who on hearing the news immediately came to the mosque. The authorities closed the three doors of the mosque and besieged the building. Finally, the authorities, without making any descrimination, kept the people inside the mosque, for nearly three days, until the night of the festival of Ramaḍān ('Īd al-Fiṭr). That night the authorities reached the decision that all the fanatics who were in the mosque should be killed.

Later on, when Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ghazzī was consulted on the incident, he disapproved of the killing of the fanatics and suggested that their leader should be dismissed and sent into exile and the others should be punished according to their crime. So, finally, the preacher and ten of his followers who pleaded guilty were exiled from the city."[74]

This event is significant in that it shows the level of hostility between the two factions of the community. Furthermore, it demonstrates the narrow-mindedness of the attackers, who no doubt were influenced by the Qāḍī-zādelis. 'Abd al-Laṭīf does not link these fanatical attackers with the Qāḍī-zāde movement directly but sees the influence of Wānī in their activities. When one takes into consideration the fact that Wānī spent two years near

---

74. 'Abd al-Laṭīf, fols. 107-8.

Bursa and, as we have already seen,[75] maintained his struggle against the Ṣūfīs in the city for two years, it is very likely that the preacher who acted as the leader of the fanatics in this incident had a connection with Wānī in one way or another. The author describes the group as muta'aṣṣıbān (fanatics) and sūkhte, which are epithets generally used by the Ṣūfīs for their opponents. The striking point here is that the fanatics were prepared to kill the Ṣūfīs in order to stop their practices and punish them. Their resorting to violence in this way may well have been prompted by the realisation that peaceful means of persuasion just had not worked and that this was their only recourse left. At certain stages in the development of the Qāḍī-zāde movement there had been violent manifestations and plots to kill opponents, but the authorities had stepped in to impose control in time.[75a]

A second significant event happened in Cairo at the beginning of the eighteenth century, but this time in a less violent situation. In her article entitled "Die Vorwahhabitische Fitna im Osmanischen Kairo 1711",[76] B. Flemming deals with the activity of a Turkish preacher and the upheaval which he caused when he objected to and rejected sharply some of the Ṣūfī practices and beliefs.

---

75. Cf. pp. 290-292, above.

75a. See above, pp. 237-241.

76. B. Flemming, "Die Vorwahhabitische Fitna im Osmanıschen Kairo 1711" in İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı Armağanı (Ankara, 1976), pp. 55-67.

The preacher, according to the chronicles, had originally came from Rūm to Cairo, where he assembled followers, mostly from amongst Turks. Cairo at that time was a centre for Ṣūfīs, where their orders were welcomed and flourished. More especially, there were in Cairo branches of some of the dervish orders which in origin were Turkish, such as the Bektāshıyya, the Mawlawiyya and the Gülshaniyya.[77]

The preacher, who is described as sūkhte and called Rūmī by the sources, came to the courtyard of the Mu'ayyad Mosque, where he began reading a risāla of Birgiwī Meḥmed Ef. (d.1573), most probably his Waṣiyyāt-nāme, to the Turkish students and in time attracted a large audience. Later on, the sūkhte took his place in the mosque pulpit and delivered an eloquent and effective sermon, which was followed by a large audience. In his sermon, as reported by the historians, the sūkhte concentrated on six important points, which were the following:

i) The miracles of saints end with their death. The miracles which appear after the death of saints are invalid and powerless.

ii) No one has access to al- Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ.[78] Of the prophets and saints no one had access to it, not even the Prophet Muḥammad .

iii) The veneration of the tombs of saints is an act of unbelief (kufr).

---

77. Trimingham, op. cit., pp.76, 233; J.M. Rogers, "al-Ḳāhıra" in EI², IV, p. 437.

78. The tablet kept in heaven; cf. Wensinck, "Lawḥ" in EI¹, III, pp. 19-20.

iv) The Ṣūfī *tekkes* should be transformed into *medreses*.

v) The practice of visiting the graves of Imām Shāfi'ī and others, and conducting public prayers there, is forbidden by law.

vi) Loud (noisy) *dhikr* at the Zuwayla Gate is forbidden.[79]

The immediate effect of the sermon was that it incited the preacher's followers to drive the rest of the crowd away from the Zuwayla Gate with knotted sticks.[80]

The claims and the views of the preacher were secretly relayed to the shaykhs of al-Azhar, who expressed their opinions on these issues in a *fatwā* in which they conveyed their disapproval of the preacher's stand on three of the questions. In this *fatwā* the shaykhs did not, however, make any comment or interpretation at all on the other ideas included in the sermon of the preacher.[81]

When this *fatwā* was delivered to the preacher, he first made sure of the strength of his followers and then demanded a public debate with the two shaykhs who had signed the *fatwā*. He applied for this to the chief *qāḍī*, who expressed his willingness that this should take place

---

79. B. Flemming, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-60.

80. *Idem*, pp. 61-62.

81. So it was apparent that they wanted to avoid a specific discussion of certain issues on which the preacher laid stress, i.e. nos. iii, v, and vi.

on the following day. But he refused, on a very flimsy pretext, to issue a written judgement on the fatwā of the Azhar, which he declared orally to be invalid. The crowd attacked the interpreter and compelled the deputy (nā'ib) of the chief qāḍī to issue a written confirmation.[82]

The next day the crowd were seething with discontent because the preacher had disappeared. They suspected the involvement of the chief qāḍī, and went and forced him to come with them to the governor. Here, too, the crowd prevailed, and the governor wrote out an order obliging the two Azhar shaykhs to appear. The debate was due to take place the next day. However, the Ottoman governor, by accusing the Mamlūk city authorities of plotting this disturbance, spurred them into taking steps to suppress it. As a result of this the leader of the Janissaries was called and he had the Mu'ayyad Mosque searched; the preacher went into hiding, some of his supporters escaped and the others were punished.[83]

A few days later it became known that the preacher had secretly been put on board a ship in Bulāq bound for Syria.[84] This incident is noteworthy in that the preacher involved was a Turk, and that he was inspired by the works

---

82. Idem, p. 62.

83. Idem, pp. 62-63.

84. Idem, p. 63.

and thoughts of Birgiwī (d1573). It is therefore probable, as suggested by the author of the article, that this preacher may have been a member of the Qāḍī-zāde group.

Although the preacher failed in his attempt to reform the religious situation in Egypt, he was at least courageous enough to raise his voice in a community where innovations and uncanonical practices and beliefs were welcomed, even by the scholars of al-Azhar. By doing this the preacher was in fact planting the seeds of reforms which were going to be achieved thirty years after him in Arabia, by ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, whose influence would be felt in the Azhar two hundred years later.[85]

The fate of the preacher in Cairo in 1711 shows that the Ottoman/Egyptian religious and ruling establishment was clearly not prepared to countenance any reaction or protest against the existing order. This hard line would inevitably discourage others from making a similar open expression of fundamentalist beliefs.

Another indication of the survival of the ideas of the Qāḍī-zādelis, even one hundred years after Qāḍī-zāde himself, is an anonymous Turkish work written against innovations and Ṣūfī practices. The book is entitled al-Risāla tuḥfat ahl al-sunna.[86] It is in a simple

---

85. B. Flemming, op. cit., p. 65.

86. There is no information in the bibliographical sources concerning this work. The MS. used here, which is in my possession, was copied in 1163/1749.

Turkish and is mainly devoted to innovations, uncanonical practices and heresies which were observed by the author in his society. The author divides his risāla into seventy-six equal sections (maṭlab), under each of which he deals with what he considers to be innovations and heresies. The author declares his intention in composing this work as follows:

> "In order to learn the sharī'a and the principles of religion, there are many books in Arabic and Persian. It was therefore felt necessary to compose a risāla in Turkish to teach all people the religion of Islam and the right madhhab (madhhab-ı ḥaqq)."[87]

The author begins with the definition of bid'a and divides it into two groups, the first being the bid'a-ı ḥasene (praiseworthy) and the second bid'a-ı qabīḥa (blameworthy), which is regarded by the author as very dangerous since it leads people astray and causes a lot of harm to the umma.[88] When he discusses blameworthy innovations the author mentions Birgiwī and his efforts to protect his brethren from innovations.[89] As a matter of fact, the author is under the influence of Birgiwī in his attitude towards innovations and Ṣūfī practices such as raqṣ and associating oneself with a mürshīd. Among the other titles of chapters, the following are a few examples:

---

87. Fol. 3a.

88. Fol. 5a.

89. Fol. 5b.

Fī ahwā' al-kufriyyāt wa min atbā' hawā'	(24a)
Ahl al-sunna wa 'l-jamā'a	(31b)
Fī 'alāmat al-mu'min al-ṣādiq	(55b)
Fī khāriq al-'āda	(76a)

The author regards every group or ṭarīqat as a deviation from the right path and in error. He therefore counts ṭarīqats such as Gulshanī, Bektāshī and all others as unorthodox.[90] His approach to the issues is very orthodox, and he sees the ahl al-sunna as the only group which is on the straight path and it is they who should be followed. He bases his argument on a tradition in which the Prophet said that the Jews were divided into seventy-one groups, the Christians seventy-two and his umma would be seventy-three, out of which one would be on the right path and the rest would be misguided. According to the author, the ahl al-sunna wa al-jamā'a are "those Muslims who accept what Allah and his Prophet have described as ḥalāl and ḥarām in the Qur'ān and in the aḥādīth (traditions), and have never suspected or denied them; their belief (īmān) is sound and their faith pure (pāk) and strong."[91]

In the author's view, Ibn 'Arabī (Muḥyī 'l-Dīn) and Ibn Sab'īn are the people who have caused corruption in the faith of the people through their theory of waḥdat al-

90. Fol. 89a.

91. Fol. 81a.

wujūd.[92] The author's hostility throughout the work is very obvious. On every occasion he attacks innovatory people who adopted blameworthy innovations, not the praiseworthy ones. It is noteworthy that the Prophet, in his traditions, does not make any distinctions between innovations, such as praiseworthy and blameworthy. In the Prophet's view, any innovation is error and every error leads to hell. It was the common practice of the majority of the Muslim scholars, however, to classify innovations in this way.

It is very likely that a closer investigation of the Turkish sources which date from the period after the Qāḍī-zāde controversy will produce more information and examples which demonstrate the continuity of these puritanical ideas among the Turks. If Qāḍī-zāde had composed his two important risālas on bid'a in Turkish, they would have attracted the same attention as the risāla or Waṣiyyat-nāma of Birgiwī. For instance, the work entitled Kitāb-ı Üsṭüwānī seems to have been very popular, judging by the existence of many copies in both public and private libraries. Thus, it can be seen that the Qāḍī-zāde movement continued to exert some influence on succeeding generations. But it is noteworthy that its influence was not greater. As has been already observed, the Qāḍī-zādelis did not have a clear or well-defined programme of reform. With the exception of the leaders of

92. Fol. 85.

the movement, Qāḍī-zāde, Üsṭüwānī and Wānī, the rest of its adherents did not have a profound knowledge of the ideals of the movement. Even during the lifetime of these three leaders, their followers behaved in a fanatical way, and this tendency became even more marked as time went on.

As has been observed, although the Qāḍī-zādelis for a considerable period had access to the throne and government officials, it appears they did not make full use of these opportunities. Their mistake was that they established a good relationship with the illiterate servants of the Palace and of the state rather than with the members of the <u>'ilmiyye</u>. Had they developed a close friendship with the <u>'ulamā'</u> in general, and also taken positions in the <u>'ilmiyye</u>, they could have laid down a sound foundation for their reforms for the future. They did not attempt to do this and, moreover, they lost the support of the <u>'ulamā'</u> by challenging their authority and position. Furthermore, their harsh and ruthless treatment of the Ṣūfīs played an undeniable role in their losing the support of the general public, upon whom the Ṣūfīs had enormous influence. The result of the Qāḍī-zādelis' intransigence was that the people were more sympathetic to the Ṣūfīs than the Qāḍī-zādelis.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

The Controversial Issues

It is difficult to isolate the exact number and nature of the issues which formed the substance of the protracted dispute both between Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī and, after their deaths, among their successors. There is also no precise information about the extent to which the issues were discussed by the public. There would appear to be two approaches to this problem, both of which together should shed light on this little-known controversy. The first would be a detailed search through the extant writings of the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs of the time. From such readings it should be possible to pinpoint those issues which preoccupied their minds and formed the basis of their arguments with the opposing group. The second approach, to supplement and analyse the first, would be to consult those historical works which were composed by historians who wrote either at the time or shortly afterwards.

When the actual writings of the participants in the controversy are discussed, certain general points emerge. Firstly, some of the discussions on both sides concentrate on classical theological or legal questions which had been already discussed on many occasions in the past. It is therefore difficult to isolate from the wide variety of the subjects treated those issues which were especially controversial.

The situation is further complicated in that the authors who composed books or risālas on the issues usually

do not make their intentions clear. In some cases, the authors write, ostensibly at least, in order to refute the claims of an author in a previous century. For instance, when Qāḍī-zāde discusses the question of raqṣ and dawarān in his Irshād al-'uqūl,[1] he in fact directs his objections against the Shaykh al-Islām 'Alī Jemālī (d. 1526), who had defended the legality of raqṣ and dawarān in the early part of the sixteenth century, although Qāḍī-zāde may well have been prompted to write in this way by the controversy in his own time.

A more fruitful approach is to discover, from a study of contemporary or near-contemporary historical works, which issues were those hotly disputed by the two sides in the controversy. In this respect the crucial work is Kātib Čelebi's Mīzān al-Ḥaqq fī ikhtiyār al-aḥaqq. Kātib Čelebi (1609-1659)[2] was a student of Qāḍī-zāde. He knew well both Qāḍī-zāde himself and his followers. Kātib Čelebi witnessed many important events and discussions, and as a noted intellectual of this period made valuable observations on the protagonists on both sides of the controversy. Although he was clearly against the Qāḍī-zādelis, he tried to be fair and objective and was certainly more balanced in his assessment of them than Na'īmā.

Kātib Čelebi completed his work Mīzān in November

---

1. Qāḍī-zāde, Irshād, fol. 2a.
2. O. Gökyay, "Kātib Çelebi" in İA.

1656[3] almost two months after the clash in the Fātiḥ Mosque between the Qāḍī-zādelis and their opponents in September 1656. The author explains his reason for composing the book as follows:

> "Since the beginning of creation it has been acknowledged among the wise that intelligence and tradition are like a pair of twins, while the reporters of intelligence and tradition are like two race-horses, and that logical proof is a staircase and a ladder to the heights of certainty, so that in matters of inquiry and speculation it is the basis of all men's speech and the referee of all things. Some men there are who, seduced by the Slinking Whisperer, have laid aside proof and through ignorance and folly have deliberately set up surmise and conjecture as a rival to proof. In more questions than one they have fallen victim to the diseases of contention and vain bigotry. Like the fanatical wars in olden times, the futile wrangling of these stupid people has well-nigh led to bloodshed. For this reason these few lines have been drafted in order to demonstrate the method of proof in the questions at issue, and the name Mizān al-Haqq fī ikhtiyār al-Ahaqq ('The Balance of Truth in choosing the Most True')

---

3. Idem (ed.), Mizānü'l-Hakk fī ihtiyāri'l-Ahakk (İstanbul, 1972), p. IV; the work is translated into English by G. Lewis, The Balance of Truth (London, 1957). The translation contains many mistakes; for corrections, see J.R. Walsh, "Kātib Chelebī, Mizānü'l-Ḥaḳ" in IQ, (London, 1959), 1-2, pp. 63-79.

> has been given to them, so that ordinary people may know what the matters of strife and dispute are, and what manner of fruit they yield."[4]

Thus Kātib Čelebi claims that he will produce a balanced, reasoned book based on proven facts rather than hypothesis.

However, the response accorded the book by the society of the time was confused and negative. There were doubts cast on the author's intentions, but these were apparently allayed by the Shaykh al-Islām of this period, a certain ʻAbd al-Raḥīm Ef. (d. 1656), a close friend of Kātib Čelebi, who declared his approval of the book in a fatwā.[5]

The work presents valuable firsthand information, especially since it is written by a man who claims at least to be presenting moderate views and arguments. Kātib Čelebi advises his readers to be flexible and tolerant of people who have a different approach to the problems of religion or society.[6]

The work is divided into twenty-one chapters, together with an introduction and conclusion. Each chapter deals with a question which has provoked discussion and dispute over the centuries between the fuqahāʾ and the Ṣūfīs. Indeed, most of these issues were discussed in every part of the Muslim

---

4. Lewis, Balance, pp. 21-2.

5. Gökyay, Mizanü'l-Hakk, p. VII.

6. Ibid.

world. There are, however, three chapters in the work which are particularly relevant to Ottoman society, namely those on tobacco, coffee-drinking and the controversy between Shaykh al-Islām Abū 'l-Su'ūd and Birgiwī Meḥmed in the sixteenth century. Above all, the final chapter of the book is devoted to the controversy between Siwāsī and Qāḍī-zāde. In this part, after giving a brief account of both shaykhs, Kātib Čelebi states that, in most of the issues which have been discussed in the book, Qāḍī-zāde upheld one side and Siwāsī the other. Both sides became more extreme in their views, and their followers only inflamed the dispute even further.[7] When Kātib Čelebi writes about himself and his education, he mentions explicitly certain issues which were discussed between the two shaykhs in the controversy. These are as follows:

a) Raqṣ/dawarān
b) The faith of the parents of the Prophet
c) The invoking of blessings on prophets and the Companions.
d) The supererogatory prayers.

In addition to this, the author, in his other work, Fadlaka, where he writes about Qāḍī-zāde, adds two more issues to the above list:

i) The cursing of Yazīd
ii) The life of the prophet Khiḍr [8]

---

7. Balance, p. 133.
8. Idem, p. 136; Fadlaka, II, p. 183.

So according to Kātib Čelebi the number of polemical issues particularly discussed by Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī was only six or seven. To these Kātib Čelebi added other issues which had long been the subject of controversy between the fuqahā' and the Ṣūfīs. Furthermore, he also included certain issues of especial relevance to his own time, such as tobacco and coffee.

In his work, Kātib Čelebi first provides the historical background to each issue and then makes reference to important classical works. It seems that his aim in referring to accepted authorities is not only to support his ideas but also to present an authority which will be acceptable to both sides.[9] Throughout the work he urges the reader and also members of both sides of the controversy not to go to extremes and, as a result, to fall into the stream of fanaticism and bigotry, which is a source of disunity and division among the members of the community. His main concern is to present reason and knowledge as the ultimate and only guide. He therefore appeals to both parties to make their arguments in the light of reason and knowledge, which will prevent them from going into the stream of fanaticism. He has a secular approach in his discussions of certain issues concerning religious affairs and society, and is very near to the thinking of Ibn Khaldūn in this respect.[10]

---

9. Gökyay, op. cit., p. V.
10. Ülken , op. cit., p. 180; Adıvar, op. cit., pp. 110-142.

A second important work which will help us to pinpoint the number of the issues involved in the Qāḍī-zāde controversy is Na'īmā's history. We have already made it clear that Na'īmā bases his account of the Qāḍī-zādelis on the lost history of Shāriḥ al-Manār-zāde and Kātib Čelebi.[10] In fact, Na'īmā copies the life-story of both shaykhs, Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī, from Kātib Čelebi.[11] He gives the number of polemical issues as sixteen, which must probably have been drawn from Shāriḥ al-Manār-zāde.

According to Na'īmā, the following issues were controversial:

1. The study of rational sciences and mathematics
2. The life of the prophet Khiḍr
3. Singing (taghannī)
4. Raqṣ and dawarān
5. Smoking and drinking coffee
6. The invoking of blessings on the Prophet and the Companions.
7. The faith of the parents of the Prophet
8. The faith of Pharaoh
9. The controversy concerning Shaykh Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī
10. The cursing of Yazīd
11. Innovations (bid'a)
12. Visitation of graves
13. Supererogatory prayers in congregation

---

10. See above, p. 3
11. Na'īmā, VI, p. 218.

14. Kissing hands, embracing one another, bowing
15. <u>Al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar</u>
16. Bribery[12]

In selecting the issues, <u>Mīzān</u> and Na'īmā's history will be taken as guides in order to provide historical background as well as to decide on the number of the issues. Since there is not actually much difference between the accounts of Na'īmā and Kātib Čelebi, the number of the issues for our study will be accepted as sixteen as presented by Na'īmā.[13] The discussion will, however, depend also on what is available from the first-hand writings of both groups.

The issues can be divided into four groups:

a) Those discussed by both sides in their writings, like <u>raqṣ</u> and <u>samā'</u>.
b) Those discussed only by the Qāḍī-zādelis, like <u>bid'a</u>, bribery.
c) Questions argued only by the Ṣūfīs, such as the faith of the parents of the Prophet.
d) Questions which were not discussed at all by either side but which are mentioned in Na'īmā and Kātib Čelebi. It is possible that the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs expressed their views either in their

---

12. Na'īmā, VI, p. 220.
13. Na'īmā groups together as one certain of the issues treated separately by Kātib Čelebi.

preachings or in lost works on these other issues which are the following:

i) Studying rational sciences

ii) The life of the prophet Khiḍr[14]

iii) Cursing of Yazīd

iv) Coffee-drinking

Numbers i, ii, iii have been omitted from the present study.

One point must be clearly understood concerning this controversy. Disagreements between the ʻulamāʼ as the representatives of the medrese and the Ṣūfīs as the representatives of the tekke were not uncommon in Muslim societies. They had, for example, taken place in Mamluk times, as well as in Ottoman society in the century before the Qāḍī-zāde dispute. But those controversies were usually limited to the circles of the intellectual élite and the Ṣūfīs of the society, and hardly included the ordinary public, so they did not create any visible divisions among the members of the community. The Qāḍī-zāde controversy, on the other hand, involved ordinary people and created distinct and mutually hostile factions. The reason for this can be found in the social, political and economic situation of the state as well as in the nature of the controversy and the aims of its leaders. The controversy between Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī took place during a crucial and delicate period of

---

14. Among the works of ʻAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī there was apparently a risāla on this issue, but it has not survived. see OM, I, 122.

Ottoman history. It should not be considered merely a dispute for the sake of controversy between two prominent preachers of the time. While no doubt it was a culmination of the sixteenth-century controversy, it also had other aims which were those of an ıṣlāḥ movement designed to make fundamental changes in Ottoman society in accordance with the Qur'ān and sunna. In order not to come into direct confrontation with the state, the Qāḍī-zādelis tried to achieve their aims through attacking the Ṣūfīs, who were not only influential among government officials, but also favoured the appearance of innovations in religious practices.

Bid'a

The word bid'a literally means innovation, novelty or recentness. But in the law it is, in general, used to define any belief or practice which has no roots in the Qur'ān and sunna or in the authority of the Companions. The concept of bid'a evolved gradually and from the second century A.H. had been an important issue amongst Muslim scholars. Two main groups emerged; those who opposed bid'a completely, such as the Ḥanbalites, and those who tolerated it to varying degrees.[15]

This subject once again became an object of discussion in seventeenth-century Ottoman society between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs. As might be expected, the former were against all sorts of bid'as, whilst the latter did not object to them. Moreover, it would appear that they held a tolerant and flexible attitude towards them.

It would not be an overestimation to state that the whole controversy between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs hinged on their difference of view about this issue. The

---

15. Goldziher, Muslim Studies, II, pp. 33-37.
M. al-Shaṭibī, Al-I'tiṣām (Beirut, n.d.) 2 vols.
B. al-Ṭurṭushī, Kitāb al-Ḥawādith wa'l-Bid'a, ed. M. Talbi (Tunis, 1959); A.Maḥfūẓ, Al-Ībdā' fī Maḍārr al-Mubtad'a, (Cairo, 1956); B. Lewis, "The significance of heresy in Islam" in SI, I (1953), pp. 43-63, reprinted in Islam in History (London, 1973), pp. 217-36.

whole Qāḍī-zāde movement may, indeed, be seen as a reaction by a group of preachers in the seventeenth century against the religious laxity which they saw around them. The main focus of their attack was existing practices which they regarded as innovations. In their writings the Qāḍī-zādelis subjected this issue to a thorough investigation in accordance with the Qur'ān and sunna. Although Üsṭüwānī and Wānī did not write in detail on this subject, Qāḍī-zāde himself devoted one of his most important risālas to this issue. Furthermore, he composed a long chapter on this question in his important work Irshād al-'Uqūl. This may be seen as an indication of the significance which he attached to this particular problem.

In his risāla, Qāmi'at al-bid'a nāṣirat al-sunna, dāmighāt al-mubtad'a[16] and under the title of "Fī wujūb al-ittibā' al-sunna sayyīd al-mursalīn (p.b.u.h.) wa fī mudhammat al-mubtada[17], in the second chapter of the Irshād, Qāḍī-zāde deals with this question in a very methodical manner. Firstly he cites the verses which order Muslims to obey and follow the Prophet. Amongst these verses is

> "Say (O Muḥammad, to mankind): If ye love Allah, follow me; Allah will love you and forgive your sins. Allah is Forgiving and Merciful." (3/31)

---

16. Qāḍī-zāde, Qāmi 'at al-Bid'a, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Birinci Serez, no. 3876, fol. I.

17. Idem, Irshād al-'Uqūl, ch. II, fol. 124a

Another verse which he quotes is:

> "That which Allah giveth as spoil unto His messenger from the people of the townships, it is for Allah and His messenger and for the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer, that it became not a commodity between the rich among you. And whatsoever the messenger giveth you take it. And whatsoever he forbiddeth, abstain (from it). And keep your duty to Allah. Lo! Allah is stern in reprisal." (59/7) [18]

In order to support his argument, Qāḍī-zāde quotes many more verses and then cites the traditions which are against any sort of innovations. Amongst such traditions is the following:

> "It is reported in Abū Dāwūd that al-'Irbāḍ b. Sārıya (May God be pleased with him) related: 'One day we offered the prayer with the Prophet (p.b.u.h.) and he then began preaching, which was very impressive and effective and moved hearts and brought tears into the eyes. And one of us said "O messenger of Allah, you are talking as if you are going to leave us: what is your advice to us?"; he replied "Fear Allah, be pious and obey whomsoever is in command, even if he be a slave from Abyssinia. Those amongst you who are going to live a long time will witness a lot of disagreement and controversies. When they occur, follow my sunna and the sunna of the rightly guided four caliphs. Hold fast to these sunnas and try hard to keep them. Abstain from novel things which

---

18. Irshād, 124a-125b.

> have appeared recently, because surely every new thing is an innovation and every innovation is a straying from the truth [or right path] and every error leads to hell."[19]"

Qāḍī-zāde in this respect exploits all the books of traditions and goes on to quote nearly all the traditions which condemn innovations as well as those who were responsible for their appearance and those who helped their spread, either by tolerating the people who practised them or by failing to oppose actively their existence and dissemination. The extent of Qāḍī-zāde's hostility to and hatred of bid'a and the ahl al-bid'a can be seen in his thorough treatment of this subject.[20]

However, Na'īmā narrates a story about Türk Aḥmad, who was one of three leaders of the Qāḍī-zādelis who were exiled to Cyprus. The story shows Türk Aḥmad's concept of bid'a. Someone who knew Türk Aḥmad one day asked him,

> "If you are going to abolish bid'a-ı hasene and bid'a, what about trousers (čaqshır) and underclothes (ṭon)? To wear them is also bid'a; are you going to abolish them too?"
>
> Türk Aḥmad replied, "Yes, we will forbid them, they can cover themselves with a waist-wrapper (izār) or large towel (peshtemal).
>
> The questioner asked again, "What about using a spoon, it is also bid'a, what are you going to do about it?"

---

19. Ibid, fol. 126a.

20. See Qāḍī-zāde, Qāmi'at al-Bid'a, fol. 7a-9b.

Türk Aḥmad replied, "It will be abolished too, they can use their hands for eating, it is not zifīr.* What is the harm if the meal sticks to their hands?"

The questioner was astonished and then said, "Look Efendi, you want to undress all the people and make them look like naked desert Arabs." [21]

* Grease or grime from smoke on a utensil; especially, the foul deposit in a pipe-stem.

21. Na'īmā, VI, p. 226.

Tobacco

One of the most important and controversial issues between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs was the question of the legality or illegality of smoking tobacco. This was the first time that such an issue was raised in a Muslim society and it is interesting to observe the attitudes of the Ottoman religious authorities, the government and people at large towards this novelty which appeared in their society.

After the discovery of America, tobacco (tütün or dukhān) was introduced into Europe by the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.[22] Its use spread from Europe to other parts of the world and tobacco became known in the Muslim world by the late sixteenth century, or the beginning of the seventeenth century. Its introduction into the Muslim world, as the sources suggest, was through Turkish sailors who most likely learned about it from British sailors in the Mediterranean.[23]

However, Turkish historians are at variance concerning the exact date of its first appearance in Ottoman society, although they are all agreed that it was sometime in the seventeenth century.[24] On the other hand, the traveller,

---

22. Encyclopaedia Britannica (15th ed. 1976), 18, pp. 464-5.
23. Ç. Uluçay, "IV Murād ve tütün yasağı" in Tarih Dünyası 35 (İstanbul, 1952), pp. 420-31.
24. The dates; Pečewī 1009/1600, K. Čelebi 1010/1601, Na'īmā 1014/1605.

Thomas Dallam, visited Turkey as early as 1599 and mentioned in his diary that when their ship approached the Dardanelles the admiral of the Turkish fleet which was anchored there was given some presents by them. Then the captain of the galley which came to search Thomas's ship asked for some presents for himself. When he was told that there was nothing to give him he demanded some tobacco and tobacco pipes; these were handed over later.[25] Most probably, the dates which are given by the Turkish historians refer to the period when its consumption became current amongst the people.

The effects and defects of tobacco are well described by the historian Pečewi as follows:

> "The English infidels brought it in the year 1009 (1600-1), and sold it as a remedy for certain diseases of humidity. Some companions from among the pleasure-seekers and sensualists said: 'Here is an occasion for pleasure' and they became addicted. Soon those who were not mere pleasure-seekers also began to use it. Many even of the great <u>ulama</u> and mighty fell into this addiction. From the ceaseless smoking of the coffee-house riff-raff the coffee-houses were filled with blue smoke, to such a point that those who were in them could not see one another. In the markets and bazaars too their pipes never left their hands. Puff-puffing in each other's faces and eyes, they made the streets and markets stink. In its honour

25. T. Dallam, "Diary" in <u>Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant</u>, T. Bent (ed.) (London, 1893), pp. 48-9.

they composed silly verses, and declaimed them without occasion.

Sometimes I had arguments with friends about it. I said: 'Its abominable smell taints a man's beard and turban, the garment on his back and the room where it is used; sometimes it sets fire to carpets and felts and bedding, and soils them from end to end with ash and cinders; after sleep its evil vapour rises to the brain; and, not content with this, its ceaseless use withholds men from toil and gain and keeps hand from work. In view of this and other similar harmful and abominable effects, what pleasure or profit can be there in it?'

To this the only answer they could give was: 'It is an amusement, and moreover a pleasure of aesthetic taste.' But there is no possibility of spiritual pleasure from this, which could pertain to matters of aesthetic taste. This answer is no answer. It is pure pretension.

Apart from all this, it has several times been the cause of great fires in the high God-guarded city of Constantinople. Several hundred thousand people suffered from those fires. Only this much is conceded, that it is of use for the guarding of galley-slaves, as the guards on the ships can to some extent ward off sleep by using it, and that, by guarding against humidity, it induces dryness. But it is not permissible, according to reason or tradition, to perpetuate such great damage for such small benefit. By the beginning of the year 1045 (1635-6), its spread and fame were such that they could not be written or expressed."[26]

---

26. Quoted in Lewis, Istanbul, pp. 133-4.

So, it appears that the people as a whole were fascinated by this new means of enjoyment and that in a short period of time tobacco spread and became very popular. The existence of coffee-houses no doubt contributed to the frequency of smoking. Now, in these places people would spend their time drinking coffee, smoking tobacco and playing games like backgammon and chess.[27] At the same time they would discuss the politics of the day.

Unlike the case of coffee-drinking, it seems that neither the official religious authorities nor the government showed any immediate reaction to this novelty, either in favour or against. So, for a considerable time it is likely that people enjoyed the opportunity to smoke. These two novelties, coffee-drinking and tobacco-smoking, prevented some of the people from going to work, and made them waste their time in the coffee houses.[28]

The first reaction against tobacco from the government can be traced back to the reign of Sulṭān Aḥmad I, who

27. Uluçay, op. cit.

28. That, of course would lead to some problems like unemployment, wastefulness, corruption and so on. But on the other hand it helped the development of a new branch of small business, which was the production of tobacco pipes, cases, boxes to keep tobacco in. See Uluçay, op. cit., p. 420.

issued a decree in 1018/1612 forbidding smoking and the trade of tobacco. The fermān describes what tobacco is and how it is consumed, its place of origin and the overwhelming response of the public towards it, finally adding:

> "The 'ulamā', the shaykhs and the common people take tobacco day and night. As a result many of them have shown the signs of illnesses and diseases, some of them have even died. It is therefore my order that from now on this tobacco must not be cultivated, bought, sold or smoked."[29]

The fermān, however, produced little effect. Similar fermāns with the same content and prohibitions were repeated several times during the years that followed. For example, there was another fermān issued in the year 1023/1614. Whereas the first fermān had concentrated on the health reasons for the prohibition of tobacco, the second was issued, as R. Baykara suggests, for mainly economic reasons.[30]

When Sulṭān 'Othmān II (d. 1622) came to the throne (1618) he adopted the same policy against tobacco. Basing himself on the previous fermāns, he issued in

---

29. Ç. Uluçay, "Tütün ve kahveye dair" in Gediz Dergisi, 45 (Manisa, 1941), p. 11.

30. R. Baykara, "Osmanlı Devletinde ilk tütün içme yasağı ve iktisadî sebebi" in Tarih Dünyası 23 (İstanbul, 1951), pp. 993-4.

1027/1618 a new *fermān* with similar wording, but this time there was also the threat of punishment to those who disobeyed the *fermān*.[31]

A more effective and tough line was taken against the use of tobacco in the period of Sulṭān Murād IV, who was determined to reimpose order and control in the capital. His first target was the coffee-houses. As his first attempt in this direction, he issued a *fermān* in 1040/1630. This was couched in strong language and prohibited the cultivation, consumption and trade of tobacco. The *fermān* also stressed that the officials and custom officers should be very careful and make thorough inspections. In the case of failure, the punishment for disobedient people and officers would be severe and heavy.[32] It would appear that the Sulṭān did not achieve the expected result, namely the cessation of smoking.

In this context the Sulṭān even sent a *khaṭṭ-ı hümāyūn* (imperial decree) to the Grand Vizier ordering him to close down all the coffee-houses and prohibiting smoking. The Grand Vizier of the time was probably Tabanı Yassı Meḥmed Pasha. Having received the decree, the Vizier, who had a clearer idea of the attitudes of the soldiers, government officials and the people, ventured to reply to the Sulṭān's decree. He composed a letter in which he

---

31. Uluçay, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

32. Uluçay, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

very briefly described the situation, mentioning the following points.

> "My Sulṭān, this social disease is widely spread among the people in general and the Janissaries and sipāhis in particular, all of whom are addicted to it. Even killing half of the population will not stop them from smoking. Particularly, the soldiers are very fond of it. Since most of the smokers are soldiers in the coffee-houses the owner cannot dare to stop them or even warn them against the prohibition. The owners of the coffee-houses therefore can do nothing against the smoking soldiers. Hence, the time is not appropriate to take a tough course of action against the smokers; it could create reaction and disorder. However, in the course of time the right action can be taken." [33]

Sulṭān Murād played a waiting game. Finally, on 27 Safar 1043/2 September 1633 a big fire broke out and destroyed one fifth of Istanbul. It was not in fact caused by careless smokers but had begun in a shipyard where caulking was carried out.[34] On 12 Rabi' I 1043/ 16 September 1633, fifteen days afterwards, Sulṭān Murād issued his famous fermān in which he prohibited both coffee and tobacco on pain of the death penalty. In this context Na'īmā makes the following observation:

> "The humble one [Naima] may state that the fact that the late Sultan Murad[IV] was so severe, and that he threatened to patrol the streets and

---

33. Topkapı Sarayı, E 7039.

34. Danişmend, Kronoloji, III, pp. 356-7; K. Čelebi, Balance, p. 59.

to put men to death as part of his abolition of coffee-houses and of smoking, was not merely a wanton prohibition or simply arbitrariness. Rather, it is plain that this was a pretext for the purpose of controlling the riffraff and for frightening the common people in the interests of the state. Now experienced, responsible men who themselves investigate the behind-the-scenes facts concerning the rebels [of Sultan Murad IV's day] and who realize the difficulties and troubles which that proud padishah experienced from these riffraff - all matters which have been fully set forth above - take into consideration the wholly good intention and the general benefit which were present underneath this severity and rigor. They perceive that at that time it was absolutely indispensable to terrify the general populace with the well-tempered sword if those who had forsaken the path of obedience and who were opposing the imperial will were to be brought back to the right way and made of use [to the state]." [35]

Thereafter, a number of coffee-drinkers and smokers were executed. All the coffee-houses were closed down and the Sulṭān is said to have personally watched over the execution of his orders and to have strictly punished transgressions with executions on the spot. His orders were not only carried out in the capital but in the provinces as well. Again Naʿīmā writes as follows:

"Because he himself knew this to be the case, [the sultan] prohibited [coffee and tobacco]. He himself would go through the city, patrol it day and night, arrest and put to death those

---

35. L. Thomas, A Study of Naima, pp. 94-5.

> riffraff and rebels and tobacco-parties whom he found by day, and make the carefree night-owls drink the cup of death. The fear of the padishah's sword so pervaded humble and great that no man could say a word about the padishah, not even in his own home. So, following the saying, "The walls have ears," they let example be the wise man's conscience."[36]

As Kātib Čelebi mentions, when the Sulṭān heard that some coffee-houses in Edirne were active, he immediately sent a __fermān__ to the Bostānji-bashı, ordering him to close down the coffee-house and to kill the owner and the people inside. This kind of measure did not, however, stop people from smoking.[37] According to Kātib Čelebi:

> "During the rigorous prohibition enforced under the late Ghazī Sulṭān Murād, many people not daring to smoke tobacco in pipes used to repel the craving by crushing the leaf and sniffing it up their noses, but subsequently they have abandoned this foolishness, for smoking without fear became possible."[38]

It is obvious from the sources that all these attempts and ruthless measures which were taken against tobacco still could not make people give it up. There is another __fermān__ of Sulṭān Murād IV, dated 1049/1639, towards the end of his life. In this __fermān__ the Sulṭān mentions that

---

36. Thomas, __op. cit.__, p. 95.
37. Na'īmā, III, pp. 160-4; K. Čelebi, __Fadhlaka__, II, p. 155.
38. K. Čelebi, __Balance__, p. 58.

although he had issued several rules for the prohibition of coffee-houses and tobacco, it was still being cultivated, sold and consumed in secrecy. Accordingly, anyone who caught such people or who could give information about them would be rewarded. Those who were caught while dealing in this sale and cultivation, or sitting in coffee-houses, must be punished.[39]

During the reign of his successor Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, as Na'īmā reported, coffee-houses began operating outside the capital, and in the following decade the prohibition lost its importance.[40] During periods of crisis, however, the coffee-houses were again shut down, as for example in 1067/1656 by the Grand Vizier Köprülü. Subsequently in 1099/1687 the government put a tax on tobacco and in this way it became legal.[41]

In the above pages the introduction of tobacco into Ottoman society has been discussed on the political and social level. The reaction of the religious authorities will now be analysed in more detail.

It was an important, indeed obligatory duty of the <u>'ulamā'</u> to pass judgement on those issues which were not mentioned either in the <u>Qur'ān</u> or in the <u>sunna</u>, in accordance with <u>qiyās</u> (analogy) or <u>ijtihād</u> (personal reasoning). As will be discussed below (p.340), the leader of the

---

39. Uluçay, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 14.

40. Na'īmā, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 164.

41. Uluçay, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 11.

Ottoman 'ulamā', the Shaykh al-Islām, publicly expressed a fatwā on coffee-drinking as early as the mid-sixteenth century.

In the case of tobacco, however, there was no expressed opinion by the highest religious authority, the Shaykh al-Islām, until the mid-seventeenth century. This absence of a public pronouncement on tobacco does not mean that the legality or illegality of tobacco was not the subject of several discussions and quarrels in religious circles. In this connection Kātib Čelebi's account is very interesting and valuable:

> "From its first appearance in Turkey, which was about the year 1010/1601, to the present day, various preachers have spoken against it individually, and many of the 'ulema have written tracts concerning it, some claiming that it is a thing forbidden, some that it is disapproved. Its addicts have replied to the effect that it is permissible. After some time had elapsed, the eminent surgeon Ibrāhīm Efendi [42] devoted much care and attention to the matter, conducting great debates in the Abode of the Sultanate, that is, in the city of Islambol, giving warning talks at a special public meeting in the mosque of Sulṭān Meḥmed,

---

42. The translator, it seems, misunderstood the phrase, Jarrāḥ Shaykhī, which can be translated, The Shaykh of Cerrāh. He was a preacher, not a surgeon. See K. Čelebi, Fadhlaka, II, p. 153; J.R. Walsh, a review of Lewis's translation, in IQ (1959), p. 69.

> and sticking copies of fetwas onto walls. He troubled himself to no purpose. The more he spoke, the more people persisted in smoking." [43]

The attitude of Qāḍī-zāde concerning this issue is well-described by Na'īmā, when he discusses the Qāḍī-zāde movement. When Sulṭān Murād IV prohibited smoking and coffee-drinking as well as coffee-houses, Qāḍī-zāde, it appears, did not fail to take advantage of this situation. No doubt it was a sinful innovation in his view and he is said to have persuaded the Sulṭān of the truth of his opinion, and to have "declared it illegal". As Na'īmā says:

> "According to his own false opinion, using independent reasoning and rational and traditional proofs, he raised his voice to the vault of Heaven with immeasurable fallacies." [44]

When it was apparently pointed out to Qāḍī-zāde that there was no divine interdiction concerning tobacco, he replied thus:

> "When the people of authority (ūlu 'l-amr) forbid, it is necessary to obey the order; it becomes necessary to kill (qatl wājib) whoever does not follow this prohibition."

---

43. Balance, p. 51. Several anonymous risālas were composed on the subject. Risāla al-Dukhānıyya, Risāla fī taḥrīm al-dukhān, Süleymaniye Library, MS. İbrahim Ef. 854/7; also see Şimşek, op. cit., pp. 168-190.

44. Na'īmā, VI, pp. 219-20. For more discussion see K. Čelebi, Mīzān, pp.33-8.

The support given to this <u>fatwā</u> by Sulṭān Murād caused rightly or wrongly the death of several people.[45]

On the other hand, the <u>Shaykh al-Islām</u> of this period, Yaḥyā Efendi who was a more obvious person for Sulṭān Murād to consult on such matters, did not issue a <u>fatwā</u> concerning the question of tobacco but he expressed his feelings in poetry which demonstrates his approval of smoking.[46] The reason for his refraining from issuing a fatwā was a probable desire on his part to avoid contradicting the Sulṭān's decree. He could easily have

---

45. K. Čelebi, <u>Fadhlaka</u>, II, p. 145; Na'īmā, III, p. 169; C. Baysun, "Murād IV" in <u>İA</u>, VIII, p. 451.

46.

دود آهی گوکلره چقدی رعایانك بكون
سز صفالرده دخان ایچمکر عالم کول دوشن

اولمه بزله دخانسز داغا اول دلستان
ننشع مجلسدر او صحرو ، ننشع اولمزمی دخان

چلك سفرهٔ سحابی یارانه كیجه كوندز
احبابله دخان ایچ اولمه صفن دو تنسز

Ibn Emin Maḥmūd Kemāl, <u>Diwān-ı Yaḥyā</u>, (İstanbul, 1334), p. 333.

been put to death by a ruthless Sulṭān for such a stand.

The official prohibition continued on and off during the reigns of Sulṭān Murād's successors, Sulṭān Ibrāhīm (1640-48) and Sulṭān Meḥmed IV (1648-87). The religious legality of tobacco was finally granted by a fatwā of Shaykh al-Islām Bahā'i Ef. in 1651. In his fatwā he pronounced as follows:

> "So long as there is no definite proof concerning its illegality it is legal, because the essence of the thing is ibāḥa."[47]

He also challenged the opponents of tobacco, the Qāḍī-zādelis, to put forward their textual proof which would make tobacco-smoking harām. The Qāḍī-zādelis could not respond to this challenge of the Shaykh al-Islām Bahā'ī Efendi. His fatwā was a sign of victory for the Ṣūfīs, who had remained silent on this issue, over the Qāḍī-zādelis.

As might be expected, the Qāḍī-zādelis did not want to accept defeat easily and they then began a campaign against Bahā'ī Efendi. They were influential among the aghas at the Palace and other important officers who did not smoke, and joining forces with these groups they did everything in their power to cause the dismissal of Bahā'ī Efendi from his high office. Their efforts proved successful and the Shaykh al-Islām Bahā'ī Efendi was dismissed from

47. Na'īmā, V, pp.61-63.

his position on 11 Jam I 1061/2 May 1656.[48]

It appears that even this official fatwā did not bring an end to the controversy and the Qāḍī-zādelis maintained their struggle to prohibit tobacco. The third leader of the Qāḍī-zādelis, Wānī Meḥmed, quotes a fatwā which was issued by a certain Imām Shaykh-zāde. This fatwā firstly describes what dukhān is and asks what is the position of those people who not only smoke it but also claim that it is lawful. In his attempt to put the view of the Qāḍī-zādelis, Imām Shaykh-zāde, according to Wānī Meḥmed, does not produce any textual evidence to prove the illegality of tobacco smoking. He attacks the problem merely from the point of view of obeying the ruler, and says:

> "It is agreed by the imāms of the four madhhabs that the rules which are issued by the Sulṭān should be obeyed (wājib), as long as they are in accordance with the sharī'a. Since there is a strong prohibition of the Sulṭān, those people who have claimed its legality are in error and mistaken."

The author then cites the Qur'ānic verse which urges the Muslims to obey Allah, His messenger and those who are in authority (V/58). He also cites some traditions (aḥādīth) in support of this verse.[49]

---

48. Bayrak, op. cit., pp. 23-6.

49. Wānī, Muḥyi 'l-sunna wa mumīt al-bid'a, fol. 24a-b.

This fatwā of Imām Shaykh-zāde fails in fact to produce a fully satisfactory argument against the legality of smoking. First of all, the prohibition of Sulṭān Murād had not been based on religious grounds. It was political and it had been issued at a time when the highest authority in religious matters, the Shaykh al-Islām, did not actually approve of the illegality of tobacco. So the Sulṭān, in order to bolster up his own position and policy, took the view of Qāḍī-zāde, rather than the officially appointed fatwā authority.[49a]

Whilst there is no reference by the Ṣūfīs in their works to the issue of tobacco, it is clear from the historical sources that they welcomed smoking and even offered refuge to smokers.[50] Their silence in this respect

---

49.[a] See above, pp. 202-3.

50. B.G. Martin, "A short history of the Khalwati order of dervishes" in Keddie (ed.), op. cit., p. 288. Na'īmā narrates a story which describes the Sulṭān's determination against the use of tobacco.

"In fact His Excellency Sivasizade told me that the late padishah [Murad IV] much of the time went about in disguise, spying out what the men of the time were up to. On one occasion the Şeyh Efendi (Sivasizade) and certain holy confreres had gone [on a picnic] to the Mirahor kiosk at Kağıthane. While they were amusing themselves there with learned intercourse, intellectual companionship, and Sufı discussion, His Majesty Sultan Murad Han approached unobserved in his boat. He had it pulled in to the shore and sent a man to bring him the books of the men present there, and also of (sic) the things which they

is not surprising. To express overtly a view in opposition to that of the Sulṭān would have been detrimental to the continued support by the Sulṭān of their orders. Perhaps, like their opponents, the Ṣūfīs were all too aware that there was no evidence in the *Qur'ān* or the *sunna* to support the view of either side.

---

had with them at their gathering. As he was looking these over, a copy of Yahya Efendi's Divan caught his eye and he exclaimed, 'Why! This is my efendi's Divan.' After he had inspected the other books as well, he said, 'I have nothing to say against, and I do not interfere with ulema who take their books and go on a picnic, or against dervishes who go with their rosaries and prayer-rugs and shawls, or yet against scribes with their pen-cases and pens and their writing materials. Let these men at once go back to their own pleasures!' And he departed. The aforesaid Aziz [Sivasizade] received high distinction in the reign of the late padishah [Murad IV], was frequently in conversation and companionship with him, and went to His Royal Majesty confidentially on a number of matters. It will be good if, God exalted willing, the particulars be heard from his own noble tongue and inserted into this history."
Thomas, *op.* and *loc. cit.*

Coffee-Drinking

The question of drinking coffee was one of the issues on which the Ṣūfīs and the Qāḍī-zādelis apparently expressed conflicting opinions according to Kātib Čelebi and Na'īmā, although there are no extant works on this from either group. The question of the legality or illegality of coffee drinking according to the Law of Islam was a new problem to the Ottoman 'ulamā', yet they were obliged to make a pronouncement on it.

It is generally believed that coffee-beans (qahwa) originally came from Abyssinia and were introduced to the Muslim world through the Yemen or Arabia during the fifteenth century.[51] There are several dates for its first appearance in the Ottoman capital; the earliest one is around 1517 after Sulṭān Selīm's campaign to Egypt.[52] It appears, however, that the practice of coffee-drinking became widespread during the reign of Süleymān the Magnificent (1520-1566). The popularity and spread of coffee-drinking was enhanced by the opening of the first

---

51. K. Čelebi, Jihan-numā' (İstanbul, 1732), pp. 535-6; C.V. Arendonk, "Kahwa" in EI[1-2], IV, pp. 449.
52. S. Ünver, "Türkiye'de kahvenin 400 üncü yıldönümü" in Tarih Dünyası (İstanbul, 1950), pp. 419-23; Danişmend, Kronoloji, II, p. 300; Mīzān, pp. 39-42. Cf. a later discussion on p. 343.

coffee-house (kahvekhāne) in Istanbul. The effects of this event are recorded by the historian Pečewī:

> "Until the year 962/1555, in the high, God-guarded capital city of Constantinople, as well as in the Ottoman lands, generally, coffee and coffee-houses did not exist. About that year, a fellow called Hakam from Aleppo, and a wag called Shams from Damascus came to the city; they each opened a large shop in the district called Tahtakale, and began to purvey coffee. The shops became meeting places of a circle of pleasure-seekers and idlers, and also of some wits among the men of letters and literati, and they used to meet in groups of about twenty or thirty. Some read books and fine writings, some were busy with backgammon and chess, some brought new poems and talked of literature. Those who used to spend a good deal of money on giving dinners for the sake of convivial entertainment, found that they could attain the joys of conviviality merely by spending an asper or two on the price of coffee." [53]

People, it seems, were fascinated with this new means of enjoyment and as a result they came from every level of society to the coffee-house. There was also a rapid increase in the number of the coffee-houses which became the meeting-place for poets and scholars, and the coffee-houses soon acquired the nickname mekteb-i ʿirfān (school of knowledge). These new places became so popular

53. Quoted in B. Lewis, Istanbul, pp. 132-3; Pečewi, I, p. 363.

that people began to neglect their religious duties and were late for prayers. This angered religious circles who considered that the coffee-houses were prejudicial to the mosques. Some <u>'ulamā'</u> were vigorous in their condemnation of the coffee-houses, saying:

> "It is the house of evil deeds; it is better to go to the tavern than there."[54]

The preachers in particular made great efforts to forbid coffee-drinking. As a result of their growing disapproval, the highest religious authority of the state felt compelled to pass judgement in regard to its consumption. The leader of the <u>'ulamā'</u> and one of the most famous <u>Shaykh al-Islāms</u> of the Ottomans, Shaykh al-Islām Abū 'l-Su'ūd, declared his legal opinion in a <u>fatwā</u> in which he argued that anything which was roasted to the point of carbonization, i.e. which became charcoal, was unlawful, hence forbidden. Moreover he ordered ships laden with coffee to be pierced and sunk.[55]

This prohibition in fact had very little effect upon the people; on the contrary, it seemed to enhance the popularity of coffee, which now acquired the attraction of

---

54. B. Lewis, <u>op.</u> and <u>loc. cit.</u>

55. R.E. Koçu, <u>Osmanlı Tarihinde Yasaklar</u>, (İstanbul, 1950) pp. 11-16; Arendonk, <u>op.</u> and <u>loc cit.</u> For the <u>fatwā</u> itself, M. Ya'qūb, <u>Kitāb Rawḍat al-Akhyār al-Munṭalib min Rabī al-Abrār</u>, MS. Atif Ef. no. 1540, fol. 1a.

the forbidden. Some time later, the chief physician of Sulṭān Süleymān the Magnificent, Badr al-Dīn al-Quṣūnī, put forward a medical opinion which was in favour of coffee in his risāla entitled. Al-Qawl al-enīs wa' l-durr al-nafīs 'alā manẓūmat al-shaykh al-ra'īs.[56] The Sulṭān also began drinking coffee. This development naturally softened the extent of prohibition and hastened the widespread consumption of coffee among the rich as well. Thereafter, at the court and among the servants of the rich there were certain people called qahvejī bashıs[57] (head coffee-makers) whose only task was to prepare and serve the coffee.[58]

But the official prohibition against coffee was not lifted until the last decade of the sixteenth century. The reason behind this continuing prohibition can be found in the importance and the effect of the coffee-houses on the society at that time. The real reason, as might be expected, was political, because people who gathered in these coffee-houses discussed and criticised current politics, the government, its acts and policies. This kind of activity attracted the attention and disapproval of the government. As a result the official prohibition was renewed during the early years of the reign of Sulṭān Murād III (982/1574-1003/1595).[58a]

---

56. S. Ünver, op. cit., p. 420.

57. Gibb-Bowen, I, appendix B, p. 344.

58. Arendonk, op. cit., p. 451.

58a. Ibid.

Coffee-drinking was officially declared lawful by a fatwā of Shaykh al-Islām Bostān-zāde Meḥmed Ef., who held the office twice, from 1589 to 1592 and 1593 to 1598. The detailed fatwā was written in verse and mentions the lawfulness as well as the benefits of coffee, especially for the digestion, for curing some illnesses and also for cleaning the throat, removing phlegm and so on.[59] The date of this fatwā is not given, but it seems that it must have been after the year 1595, since that was the year when Sulṭān Murād III, who had prohibited coffee-drinking, died.

This lifting of the prohibition gave relief to the people and they adopted a very much more relaxed way of life, as is narrated by Kātib Čelebi:

> "They (the coffee-houses) were opened everywhere; freely on every street corner a coffee-house appeared.
>
> Story-tellers and musicians diverted the people from their employments, and working for one's living fell into disfavour. Moreover, the people, from prince to beggar, amused themselves - with knifing one another."[60]

There were other official prohibitions of coffee-drinking during the early seventeenth century, first in the reign of Aḥmad I (1603-1617) and then later during that of Sulṭān Murād IV. These were in fact directed at

59. For the fatwā, British Museum MS. Add. 7828.

60. Balance, p. 61.

coffee-houses rather than coffee-drinking and were again motivated by political considerations. People in those places were not only drinking coffee, playing games and wasting time, but they were also smoking and invariably discussing current political issues and criticising the government. That, of course, attracted the government's attention and suspicion, and Sulṭān Murād IV in order to stop people from indulging in this sort of conversation issued a ferman to close down all the coffee houses and to prohibit smoking. Amongst his reasons was the fear of fire which might be caused by smokers.[61]

It was during Sulṭān Murād IV's reign that Ottoman society, according to the contemporary historian Kātib Čelebi, witnessed a controversy on coffee-drinking and smoking between some of the preachers of that time, led by Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed and the Ṣūfīs, who were led by Siwāsī.[62]

It appears that coffee-drinking may have been introduced into Ottoman society by Ḥajjīs who travelled to the Arabian peninsula to perform the Ḥajj. While they were there they found coffee pleasant and they took some back home with them. Another theory argues that coffee came to Turkey through Ṣūfī circles, in particular the Shādhiliyya dervishes from Egypt, who considered coffee a

---

61. Balance, loc. cit.; Arendonk, op. and loc. cit.

62. H. Kissling, "Aus der Geschichte der Chalvetijje-Ordens" in ZDMG, 102 (1953), p. 270.

splendid stimulant which helped them in their nightly prayers.[63] Some Ṣūfīs consumed the coffee-beans by eating them raw, others drank coffee made from ground beans. They realized that they had found in that a splendid aid to asceticism and the meditative life, because of the inherent characteristics of caffeine which facilitated certain exercises by keeping them awake.[64]

The Khalwatiyya order of dervishes, who regarded coffee as useful and helpful for their nightly devotions and during their stay in the Khalwa, in order to prevent sleeping, immediately adopted this new drink. Other Ṣūfī orders quickly followed suit.

The sources are silent in regard to the people who first used coffee in Istanbul and to the way in which it became so popular that it was brought there by ship. It is noteworthy that, although coffee was declared lawful by the highest religious authority in the state sometime after 1595, it appears the controversy about its legality or illegality continued during the seventeenth century.

The origin of the controversy concerning coffee-drinking between the two famous preachers of the time,

---

63. Al-Anṣārī, "'Umdat al-Safwa fi ḥall al-qahwa," in Silvestre de Sacy, Chrestomathie Arabe (Paris, 1826), pp. 138-169, trs. 412-483.

64. Kissling, op. and loc. cit.

Qāḍī-zāde and Siwāsī, who had already had major differences on other issues, is difficult to explain since there is no reference by either side to this question in their writings. Yet one may speculate on the reasons behind this dispute. First of all, the nature of the controversy was at this stage not religious but political and legal. In this case the position of Qāḍī-zāde may be postulated as follows: he may have opposed coffee-drinking in order to support the Sulṭān's policy against coffee-drinking as well as smoking in the coffee-houses, where people held discussions on current issues. In turn he could thereby attain the Sulṭān's recognition and attention, which would help him in his discussions against Siwāsī, and the Ṣūfīs. In any case, he doubtless considered coffee-drinking as a bid'a (innovation) and he therefore objected to it and did not want to see its consumption among the Ṣūfīs, who considered themselves as a religious group. Moreover, his opponent Siwāsī, his order and followers were those who drank coffee and smoked tobacco. So it was natural for Qāḍī-zāde to discredit and weaken the position of the Khalwatīs and in particular, their leader Siwāsī, in the sight of the Sulṭān and the people, by declaring coffee-drinking illegal or bid'a. As a result, the Ṣūfīs were drawn into the controversy by their opponents.

But the campaign of Qāḍī-zāde and his followers did not have the desired effect on the people. Indeed, because of their flexible and tolerant attitude towards coffee-drinking as well as smoking, and their continuing use of these commodities, the Ṣūfīs won the sympathy of

the people in general, and of the users of tobacco and coffee in particular. This attitude brought them popular support and even a rapid increase in the number of their adherents,[65] who could drink coffee and smoke under the shelter of the tekke.

According to Na'īmā, the tough course of action taken by Sulṭān Murād IV against coffee-houses was relaxed during the reign of his successor, Sulṭān Ibrāhīm (1640-48) outside the capital.[66] This was not the end of the controversy, however. After a short interval it appears that the subject was discussed again by Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed, the second leader of the Qāḍī-zāde movement, and by his opponent, Niyāzī al-Miṣrī, until the fatwā of the Shaykh al-Islām Bahā'ī Meḥmed, who pronounced in favour of the lawfulness of coffee-drinking as well as smoking in 1062/1651. This fatwā was considered to be the primary cause of his dismissal from the office on 11 Jūm I 1062/ 2 May 1651.[67]

---

65. B.G. Martin, "A Short History of the Khalwati" in Keddie (ed.) op. cit., p. 288.
66. Na'īmā, III, p. 160.
67. Martin, op. cit., p. 289. Bernard Lewis is mistaken when he gives the date of the fatwā of Bahā'ī Meḥmed and his dismissal from the office of Shaykh al-Islām as 1634, because Bahā'ī at that time was qāḍī of Aleppo, and he was dismissed from that job in that year and exiled to Cyprus. The cause of his dismissal

The prohibition of the coffee-houses was, however, renewed during the Köprülü period for political reasons, while the drinking of coffee at home, the smoking of tobacco and trading in these two commodities were made legal. [68]

---

from Aleppo was smoking, but he did not issue the fatwā at that time. There was a disagreement between the governor of Aleppo and Bahā'ī himself, so the governor made a complaint about Bahā'ī saying "he is a very heavy smoker." For details, see M. Bayrak, Bahā'ī Meḥmed Efendi, İstanbul University graduation dissertation 1960-1, no. 33, pp. 8-9, İstanbul University Library.

68. Arendonk, op. and loc. cit.

Samā' or Raqṣ

The dispute in Islām between the jurists and the Ṣūfīs on the question of the legality or illegality of raqṣ or samā' was a long-standing one. From the eleventh century onwards, this controversy was discussed and renewed in many parts of the Islamic world. As far as the Ottoman state is concerned, the dispute began only in the sixteenth century. It seems that at this point in Ottoman society for the first time it was possible to see the development of anti-Ṣūfī trends among prominent jurists, scholars and Shaykh al-Islāms, despite the encouraging attitude of the rulers towards the Ṣūfīs. Several risālas and fatwās were composed in the sixteenth century either in order to encourage and legalize samā' and raqṣ or to prove their illegality on the basis of religious sources. Writers on the issue may be divided into two groups:

a) Those who were in favour of samā' and raqṣ:
Shaykh al-Islām 'Alī Jamālī (d. 1526)[69]; Qinalı-zāde 'Alī (d. 1570)[70] and Shaykh Sinān (d. 1529).[71]

---

69. A. Jamālī, Devrān-ı Ṣūfiyyenin cevazīna dā'ir risāla, Süleymaniye Library, MS. M. Arif 212/2, idem, Risāla fi'l-dhikr al-jahrī wa'l-dawarān, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Es'ad Ef. 1761/6.

70. Risāla fī dawarān al-Ṣūfiyya, British Museum, MS. Or. 12933, III, fols. 28b-30a.

71. Risāla fi'l-Taḥqīqiyya, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Esad Ef. 1691/1.

b) Those who were against it:
Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Kemāl (d. 1536),[72] Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 1539)[73] and Shaykh al-Islām Abū'l-Su'ūd (d. 1574).[74]

The seventeenth century witnessed a controversy unprecedented in the Ottoman state between the two groups, who renewed the argument in a more hostile and emotional manner than hitherto. Indeed, power and force were employed rather than persuasive arguments. Not all those involved in the dispute were, however, ready to resort to such methods. A number of risālas and books on the issue were written from the beginning of the century onwards. These include the works of the famous shaykh of the Jalwatiyya, 'Azīz Maḥmūd Hüdāyī (d. 1619) and

---

72. Ibn Kemāl, Risāla fī taḥqīq al-Ḥaq wa ibṭāl ra'y al-Ṣūfiyya fi 'l-raqṣ, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hüsrev Paşa, 98.

73. I. al-Ḥalabī, al-Rahṣ wa'l-waqṣ li-mustaḥill al-raqṣ, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Es'ad Ef. ff. 222-232.

74. See E. Düzdağ, Şeyhulislām Ebussuud Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. asır Türk Hayatı (İstanbul, 1972), p. 83.

involved the Ṣūfīs themselves, who took an active part in the controversy. 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī (d. 1661), Ismā'īl Ruṣūkhī (d. 1630) and Siwāsī composed risālas which were intended to serve two purposes; to provide a stimulus to the followers of the Ṣūfī path and to respond to opponents who completely rejected this practice and its existence within Islamic teaching.

According to the Ṣūfīs, samā' or raqṣ is not a kind of pleasure or pastime or a source of enjoyment, as their opponents claim. On the contrary, it was considered to be an act of worship and performed as such by early leaders of the Ṣūfīs, such as Junayd (d. 910),[75] Shiblī (d. 846)[76] and Nūrī (d. 908).[77, 78] It is therefore not forbidden,

---

75. A. Abdel Kader, The Life and Personality of al-Junayd (London, 1962), p. 2. Al-Junayd defines samā' in the sense of listening to the recitation of the Qur'ān. See Qushayrī, Risāla, pp. 153, 156; al-Sarrāj, al-Lumā', p. 272.

76. Al-Sulāmī, Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya ed J. Pedersen, (Leiden, 1960), p. 340. Shiblī also regards samā' as listening to the recitation of the Qur'ān. Al-Lumā', p. 272; Qushayrī, Risāla, p. 155.

77. Al-Sulāmī, op. cit., pp. 151-56. Nūrī also means listening to the Qur'ān. See al-Lumā', p. 289; Qushayrī, p. 127.

78. Rusūkhī, Ḥujjat al-Samā' (İstanbul, 1256), p. 3.

in fact it is permissible (mubāḥ).[79]

The Ṣūfīs were naturally very sensitive about their practice; they therefore tried to make a distinction between the kind of samā' and raqṣ which they performed and the other usages of these two words which were commonly known among the ordinary members of society. As a matter of fact, contemporary authors used different words to denote the same thing. For instance 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī used dawarān instead of raqṣ. According to him "raqṣ" in the dictionary means a sort of measured motion with the intention of play or dance. In common parlance it has the meaning of playing or dancing to the accompaniment of musical instruments.[80] Therefore using the word raqṣ in order to define the Ṣūfī way of dancing is wrong. Moreover, it is an error to compare these two. On the other hand, Rusūkhī Ef. accepts the word raqṣ in order to define this action.[81]

According to the Ṣūfīs, samā', raqṣ or dawarān is not ḥarām; in fact, on the contrary, there is clear evidence of this from the sharī'a. In this connection they cite the tradition concerning the play of the

---

79. Ibid., p. 4.

80. 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī, Risāla fī Ḥaqq al-Dawarān al-Ṣūfiyya (İstanbul, n.d.), p. 93.

81. Rusūkhī, op. cit., p. 4. In fact he uses the words samā', raqṣ and dawarān interchangeably.

Abyssinians which the Prophet watched with his wife 'Ā'isha.[82]

"If it was forbidden, the Prophet would not have watched and nor would he have let his wife watch. Therefore it is not harām. If their raqṣ is not harām, why should the raqs of the Mawlawīs and the Ṣūfīs in general be considered unlawful? Hence, not every raqṣ is illegal, but the raqṣ which is performed with the intention of pastime and play is illegitimate. Otherwise the Aṣḥāb would not have performed it when they were joyful, as happened in the case of the daughter of Hamza."[83]

Moreover, even the Prophet David used to dance or perform raqṣ when he was happy. There is abundant evidence for this.[84]

According to the Ṣūfīs, samā' is also permitted and there are several proofs in favour of it. Rusūkhī, quoting from Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 996)[85] claims that amongst the Aṣḥāb, 'Abdallah b. Ja'far performed samā'

---

82. A. Nūrī, p. 94; Rusūkhī, p. 5.

83. See D.B. Macdonald, "Emotional religion in Islam as affected by music and singing" in JRAS (1901), pp. 195-252, 705-48.

84. A. Nūrī, op. cit., p. 94; Rusūkhī, op. cit., p. 7.

85. Muhamed Shukrī, The Mystical Doctrine of Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī as found in his book Qūt al-Qulūb, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh (1976), p. 26.

and some others did too. [86] Therefore, those who deny the permissibility of samā' are in error. The Ṣūfīs even assert that there are verses in the Qur'ān in support of samā', like the verse "He multiplieth in creation what He will. Allah is able to do all things" (35/1) and "Say, who hath forbidden the adornment of God which he hath provided for his creatures, and agreeable things of sustenance." (7/32, 31/6, 39/18)

The Ṣūfīs assert that their opponents cannot produce any sort of evidence which would forbid samā' and raqṣ. They cannot produce any convincing argument, based on sound sources and proofs. In the absence of such proofs, they claim that there is an ijmā' which makes the issue illegal. [87]

---

86. Rusūkhī, p. 16. The author does not explain what sort of samā' they did perform. In fact, he is misrepresenting the opinion of al-Makkī, who treated the subject like an authority on ḥadīth and divided samā' into three categories.

87. The Ṣūfīs are very suspicious and wary about the existence of ijmā'. In the case of its presence they study it (ijmā') very carefully and divide it therefore into several categories like, "Ijmā'-ı Qāṭiʿ, Ijmā'-ı Tewātur, etc."
Nūrī, p. 96; Rusūkhī, p. 15.

Furthermore, the Ṣūfīs, having realized their strong position and convincing proofs, even attempt to examine the validity and the authenticity of the objections which were brought forward by their opponents. So, they state that "since there is neither naṣṣ nor qiyās (analogy) on samā' and raqṣ it is indisputable that the claims of our opponents are false and baseless. Accordingly, this practice, like all other permissible practices, remains legitimate (mubāḥ)."[88] Moreover, 'Abd al-Aḥād Nūrī asserts that "in the case of the emergence of innovations or new trends among the members of the Islamic society, the 'ulamā' hold a firm and rigid attitude and moreover find reasons against these things in order to prevent them from spreading and becoming customary, but in spite of their efforts and hard attitude, if these innovations and new trends become widespread and customary among the members of the society, the 'ulamā' then try very hard to introduce a new interpretation and excuses concerning these practices in order to present them as permissible and lawful. In fact, this is the origin of the fatwā. This is, also, the reason behind the contradictory statements, fatwās and risālas, concerning samā' and raqṣ."[89]

On the other hand, as might be expected, the Qāḍī-zādelis put forward their opinions, which naturally present a sharp contrast with the Ṣūfīs, in regard to the issue

---

88. Nūrī, p. 98; Rusūkhī, p. 24.

89. Nūrī, p. 101.

under discussion. Three famous leaders of the Qāḍī-zādelis expounded their opinions in their works on this subject.[90] They start their objection with a definition of raqṣ, which is "a sort of movement or activity which has no use or purpose either in regard to religion or to the material world. Therefore the dictionaries do not make any distinction between raqṣ and pastime, amusement, enjoyment."[91] Since, according to the fuqahā', it is considered as a pastime and amusement, therefore it should not exist in Islam.

According to Qāḍī-zāde, the raqṣ which is performed by the Ṣūfīs has no place in Islam, because of its being a pastime and amusement. In this connection Qāḍī-zāde draws the reader's attention to his own time and describes the performance of raqṣ by the Ṣūfīs as follows:

> "When you look at the performance of the raqṣ of the Ṣūfīs in mosques and in tekkes where the Ṣūfīs assemble with ignorant people, innovators and young boys, who do not even know what cleanliness, īmān, islām, halāl and harām are, they perform raqṣ with them to the

---

90. Qāḍī-zāde, Irshād al-'Uqūl, chapter II, ff. 22a-67b; Kitāb-ı Üsṭüwānī, bāb beyān-ı dawarān wa'l-raqṣ, fols. 13a-20a; Wānī, Muḥyi'l-sunna wa mumīt al-bid'a, section fī ḥurmat daff wa'l-raqṣ, fols 11a-14b.

91. Qāḍī-zāde, fol. 22b; Wānī, fol. 13a.

accompaniment of music, songs and poems, shouting and crying [in a manner] which resembles praying; they change thus the works of God in their *dhikr* and utter nonsense and delirium."[92]

Then the author cites the following verse in order to describe them:

> "O ye who believe! Choose not for friends such of those who received the Scripture before you, and of the disbelievers, as make a jest and sport of your religion. But keep your duty to Allah if ye are true believers." (5/57)

In this connection he cites another verse:

> "Turn not thy cheek in scorn toward folk, nor walk with pertness in the land. Lo! Allah loveth not each braggart boaster." (31/18)

Then he cites a tradition in favour of his statement, the gist of which is that one belongs to those whom one imitates.[93] Qāḍī-zāde even ventures to claim that *raqṣ* was originally invented by al-Sāmirī, who lived at the time of the prophet Moses.[94]

In order to make their claim strong and their argument convincing, the Qāḍī-zādelis appeal after the *Qur'ān* to the traditions of the Prophet, and in this connection they cite several of them which they claim are against *raqṣ* and *samā'*. The first tradition which they

92. Qāḍī-zāde, fol. 24a.

93. Qāḍī-zāde, *op.* and *loc. cit.*

94. Qāḍī-zāde, fol. 26a; cf. also Üsṭüwānī, fol. 112a

quote is one forbidding every sort of game or play except three, which are: one's play with one's wife, with one's horse, and with bows and arrows.[95]

Qāḍī-zāde and Üsṭüwānī quote especially from Ibn Taymiyya[97] and Ibn Qayyim.[98] In fact, the attitude which was held by the Qāḍī-zādelis is demonstrably very much under the influence of these two scholars, as well as that of famous

---

95. Wānī, fol. 13b; Qāḍī-zāde, fol. 24a. The tradition is reported in different versions and it is not considered authentic by Shawkānī, Nayl al-Awṭār, III, p. 86.

96. Wānī, fols. 19a-b.

97. Ibn Taymiyya, Kitāb al-Samā' wa'l-Raqṣ in Majmu'at al-rasā'il al-Kubrā (Cairo, 1966), II, pp. 295-330.

98. Ibn Qayyim, Ighāthat al-Lahfān, (Cairo, 1961), I, pp. 242-284.

Ottoman scholars like Ibn Kemāl, Čiwi-zāde, Birgiwī and Ḥalabī.

According to the Qāḍī-zādelis, raqṣ and samā' are innovations. Qāḍī-zāde, quoting from Imām al-Qurṭubī, makes the following statement:

> "Surely music, beating drums and raqs are ḥarām according to the ijmā' of Imām Mālik, Abū Ḥanīfa, al-Ṣafī' and Aḥmad [ibn Ḥanbal]." [99]

In this connection Üsṭüwānī refers to the work of Ibrāhīm Ḥalabī, who devoted a risāla proving the illegitimacy of raqṣ. [100] Therefore, it is permissible to listen to the recitation of the Qur'ān and sermons in the mosque, but if listening to music is involved it is ḥarām. Indeed it is the unanimous decision of the 'ulamā' that it is ḥarām. [101] Üsṭüwānī, quoting from Kitāb-ı Hawādith asserts that samā' which he defines as to sing songs and to listen to them, and raqṣ, which is performed by the Ṣūfīs of the day, are ḥarām." [102]

---

99. Qāḍī-zāde, fol. 25b; concerning the four imāms' view of music, samā' and raqṣ, there are contradictory reports; see J. Robson, Tracts on Listening to Music (London, 1937), p. 2; S. Uludağ, pp. 150-230; Üsṭüwānī, fols. 113a-114a.

100. İ. Ḥalabī, al-Rahṣ wa'l-waqṣ li-mustaḥill al-raqṣ, Süleymaniye Library, MS.

101. Wānī, fol. 17a.

102. Üsṭüwānī, fol. 112a.

On the other hand, the Qāḍī-zādelis concede the permissibility of singing, dancing and beating the tambourine and drum on the occasion of a marriage, festivals, war and other cases which occurred at the time of the Prophet.[103]

Above all, the Qāḍī-zādelis make an important distinction between the early Ṣūfīs and their attitude towards the Qur'ān and the sunna, and the Ṣūfīs of their own age whom they oppose strongly. They even question the origin of Ṣūfīsm. Moreover, Wānī in this connection gives the following statement as a tradition:

> "The Prophet said, 'The day of judgement will not take place unless from among any followers there emerges a group which call themselves Ṣūfīs and their signs will be the making of dhikr loudly. They will consider themselves as being in the path of piety, whereas their shaykhs are misguided more than the kuffār. Their actions will be similar to these of Dajjāl and their practices will resemble these of Satan. Moreover, they will argue with the 'ulamā'. They will have no faith [belief] and will like music (ghinā) and raqṣ, they will listen and find ecstacy and they will beat the tambourine with their hands. All of these [actions] are ḥarām, and are inherited from the Jāhiliyya. Allah said in the Qur'ān, 'I created the jinn and human kind only so that they might worship Me.'"[104]

---

103. The attitude of the Qāḍī-zādelis is identical with that of Ibn Taymiyya.
104. Wānī, fol. 19b. This tradition cannot be traced and its style and language are unusual for a tradition. It is very likely that it is a fabrication.

Again, on this issue Üsṭüwānī quotes from al-Ṭarṭushī, who was asked about the Ṣūfīs, to which he replied, "Their way is false (bāṭıl) and (comes from) ignorance and error."[105] Through comparing the practice and performance of the Ṣūfīs of their own time and the early Ṣūfīs, it seems that the Qāḍī-zādelis felt the necessity of making a differentiation between these two. It appears that they consider the early generation as Zuhhād rather than Ṣūfīs. In order to show his approval of the early practices of the Ṣūfīs, Qāḍī-zāde makes frequent reference to the early Ṣūfīs and quotes from such men as Abū Yazīd al-Bisṭāmī (d.874), who spent many years attempting to control his nafs,[106] al-Junayd (d. 910), Nūrī (d. 908)[107] and Imām al-Qushayrī [108].

To sum up, this investigation into the attitude of the Ṣūfīs and the Qāḍī-zādelis in regard to the question of the legality or illegality of samā' and raqṣ reveals an unbridgeable gulf between the two groups.

---

105. Üsṭüwānī, fol. 112a.

106. Arberry, Muslim Saints and Mystics, p. 100.

107. Qāḍī-zāde, fols. 77a-b.

108. Idem, 80a.

When one examines the Ṣūfīs' approach to the issue it is clear that, in order to give the impression that they held the upper hand, they resorted to the use of unauthentic traditions to bolster up their arguments. Moreover, Ṣūfī authors sometimes deliberately simplify issues which are much more complicated in earlier writers.[109] As for the Qāḍī-zādelis, they treated the sources in much the same way as the Ṣūfīs did. This is particularly so of Wānī Meḥmed who cited three fabricated statements which were treated as traditions by him. In order to show his enmity towards the Ṣūfīs, he declared the Ṣūfīs to be worse than the *ḳāfirs*.

It is important to stress that the Qāḍī-zādelis were attacking the Ṣūfīs in their own time and society. In fact, in order to make a clear presentation of what they considered to be Ṣūfism, they made a comparison between the Ṣūfīs of their own day and those of earlier generations. This can be taken as an indication that the Qāḍī-zādelis were not, in fact, against Ṣūfism, which they considered to be within the framework of Islam and in accordance with the *Qur'ān* and the *sunna*. However, they objected to the Ṣūfism which existed in their own time since it was spoilt by the presence of innovations.

---

109. When Rusūkhī quotes from al-Makkī through al-Ghazāli, he does not specify the *samā'* which al-Makkī mentions, but implies that his own interpretation is the same as that of al-Makkī.

Taghannī

One of the most prolonged controversies between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs concerns the question of whether listening to music is lawful or forbidden, according to the precepts of Islam. On this issue alone, many books and tracts were composed by Muslim scholars who supported both viewpoints from the ninth century onwards.[110]

In the seventeenth century, this question also was one of the hotly disputed issues. Concerning this problem the Qāḍī-zādelis expressed their opinion in their writings. Üsṭüwānī and Wānī, without discussing the question in detail declared it as ḥarām,[111] where as Qāḍī-zāde treated the subject in detail.[112]

---

110. Ibn Abī 'l-Dunyā, Dhamm al-Malāhī (ed. tr.) by J. Robson, (London, 1938); M.T. al-Ghazāli, Bawāriq al-Ilma' (ed. tr.) J. Robson (London, 1938); S. Uludağ, İslām Acısından Mūsikī ve semā' (İstanbul, 1976); İ. Rusūkhī, Ḥujjat al-Samā' (İstanbul, 1256); A. Rabbihi, Kitāb al-'Iqd al-Farīd (trs. by Farmer, Music Priceless Jewel) (Scotland, 1942).

111. Üsṭüwānī, Kitāb-ı Üsṭüwānī, fol. 111a-112b; Wānī, Muḥyi'l-sunna wa mumīt al-bid'a, fol. 14a-b.

112. Qāḍī-zāde, Irshād al-'Uqūl, fols. 55-78, 157, 169-172.

Qāḍī-zāde considers the issue an important subject and says that some people regarded it as harām, some declared it permissible. He then goes on to define the word, its usages and relations with laḥn.[113]

In Qāḍī-zāde's view there are two sorts of ghinā', that which is lawful and that which is not. The former includes singing to remove boredom and to provide recreation.[114] Singing and beating drums during the marriage ceremony are also permitted.[115] He even considers ghinā' is permitted in the recitation of the Qur'ān so long as it does not change the pronunciation of the words. He says:

> "As for ghinā' which means a good or lovely voice, then it is recommended; someone said in the Tatār khāniyya that the recitation of the Qur'ān with ghinā' is recommended (مستحب) if it does not change the words or distort them but simply improves their sounds and pronunciation in reading in prayer or otherwise. But if singing changes the words then this damages the prayer and this is forbidden."[116]

On the other hand, the author considers ghinā', singing for fun or listening for fun (ملاهى) to be forbidden. Beating drums, tambourines or similar

---

113. Idem, Irshād, fol. 171b.
114. Idem, fol. 171a.
115. Idem, fol. 157a.
116. Idem, fol. 171a.

instruments is prohibited and is regarded as disobedience, in accordance with the Prophet's saying "Casual fun (ملاهي) is disobedience and sitting with those who are practising it is wickedness (فسق) and enjoying such practices is kufr."[117] In this attitude Qāḍī-zāde has the same attitude as Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim.[118]

The Ṣūfīs defended the legality of ghinā' in their writing. 'A. 'Aḥad Nūrī and İsmā'īl Anqarawī are two main proponents of the Ṣūfī viewpoint in the seventeenth century.

According to Anqarawī to listen to a beautiful voice is not unlawful. If the voice is that of a man, or the sound of a bird, or of a drum or tambourine, it makes no difference, so long as the sound is fine and good.[119] In order to strengthen his argument the author quotes many traditions. He then makes the following statement:

> "Ghinā' arouses good feelings and emotions in the heart, as in the case of two singing girls in the Prophet's house on the day of a festival and also when the Prophet arrived

---

117. Idem, 172b.

118. See J.N. Bell, Love Theory in Later Hanbalite Islam (Albany, 1979), pp. 11, 17, 24, 36, 124.

119. İ. Anqarawī, Ḥujjat al-Samā', p. 18.

at Medina for the first time people greeted him by singing." 120

In order to prove the legality of ghinā', 'A.A. Nūrī questions the statements in Tatārkhāniyya, Qāḍī Khān and Khulāṣat al-Fatāwā. He then says : "In the tradition which says to hear fun (ملاهى) is disobedience and to sit there is fisq and to enjoy it is kufr, in fact there is warning and exaggeration. Otherwise the prohibition of fun (ملاهى) is not certain."[121] The author also states that this particular tradition is not a strong one and it cannot be accepted with certainty. He also states that not every kind of fun is prohibited and in this connection he gives some examples.[122]

In this discussion, the two parties adopt a predictable stand on this issue. The Qāḍī-zādelis, with the exception of Qāḍī-zāde, consider every sort of ghinā' (music) as harām while the Ṣūfīs regard all fine and good music which arouses good and holy feelings in the heart as permissible.

---

120. Idem, p. 22.

121. 'A.A. Nūrī, Risāla fī haqq... p. 98.

122. Idem, p. 98.

Visiting Tombs

The issue of visiting tombs and graves was one of the important controversial questions between the Qāḍīzādelis and the Ṣūfīs in the seventeenth century.

In the previous century, Birgiwī Meḥmed (d. 1572), probably for the first time in Ottoman society, brought up the problem, discussed its importance and implications and explained the correct form of its performance. He therefore composed a risāla which is entitled "Ziyārāt al-qubūr".[123] As a matter of fact he merely quoted the risāla of Ibn Qayyim word for word in his book Ighāthat al-Lahfān.[124] Birgiwī also in his books al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya and Waṣiyyatnāme, briefly touches upon the same problem.

The appearance of a non-Islamic mode of visitation which involved solely the veneration of the tombs of the saints or holy men can be traced back to the development of Ṣūfism in the Muslim world. As is pointed out by Goldziher, "the belief in the sanctity of the saints' graves reaches its peak in the idea of the merit of pilgrimage to them (ziyāra), or even that the ziyāra to the graves of saints could replace the hajj." [125]

---

123. Birgiwī, Ziyārāt al-qubūr (Riyāḍ, n.d.)

124. Ibn Qayyim, Ighāthat al-Lahfān min maṣāyīd al-shayṭān (Cairo, 1961), I, pp. 205-41 .

125. Goldziher, Muslim Studies, II, p. 287.

The widespread practice of uncanonical visitation of graves alarmed the fuqahā' who as the official guardians of the Sharī'a felt the necessity of protecting Muslim communities from this harmful innovation. In this field the well-known Ḥanbalī jurists Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim objected firmly to these practices and proved their illegality according to the Qur'ān and sunna. The former in his book entitled al-Tawassul wa'l-wasīla and his fatāwās explains the Islamic mode of visitation of tombs while very firmly rejecting the non-Islamic practices. The latter, in his above mentioned work, maintains the same argument as Ibn Taymiyya. His view was taken over by Birgiwī and later by Qāḍī-zāde himself and his followers.

The Ṣūfīs' approach to the question is explained and put forward by Siwāsī in his work Durar al-'aqā'id. However, his successor 'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī, also dealt with the problem in detail and devoted a separate risāla to it which, unfortunately, has not survived. But his views can be obtained from his other work Maw'ıẓa-i Ḥasana.[126]

Siwāsī treats the issue under the section of "fī nef'i Du'ā lil Emwāt",[127] and begins the discussion

---

126. A. Nūrī, Risāle fī nef'ı mesā'ı al-Ehyā-u-lil-Emwāt, OM, i, p. 122; Maw'ıẓa-i Ḥasana, (İstanbul 1309), pp. 228-33.

127. Siwāsī, Durar al-'aqā'id, fol. 58b.

by referring to the benefit which can be obtained by visiting graves, and offering prayers for the deceased. According to the author, the act of visiting graves is beneficial to both the visited and the visitor. If a pious (ṣāliḥ) man visits the grave of a rebel (ʿaṣī) and offers prayers and gives charity for him, it is possible (jāʾiz) for the deceased to be forgiven. If the case is reversed and a pious man is visited, it is also possible (jāʾiz) for the visitor to gain abundance (fayḍ) and light (nūr). Following this statement Siwāsī cites a tradition "When you have difficulties in your affairs, seek help from the inhabitants of graves."[128] He then mentions a saying of the famous Ottoman Shaykh al-Islām, Ibn Kemāl (d. 1636), who stated that "in visiting graves of the saints (awliyāʾ) there is great benefit."

Then he discusses the attitude of Ibn Taymiyya towards the visitation of graves. He mentions Ibn Taymiyya's denial of the benefit of the visitation of graves and his subsequently being considered as kāfir by the scholars of Egypt. In order to support his case, Siwāsī cites a fatwā which is as follows: "If Zeyd denies the benefit which will be obtained by visiting the graves of ʿalim mutlaq, awliyāʾ and ʿulamāʾ ṣāliḥ what should be done to him?" The reply was that "It is necessary for him to ask forgiveness."[129]

---

128. The tradition cannot be traced in the authentic books of traditions.

129. Durar al-ʿaqāʾid, fol. 59a.

Furthermore, the author claims that despite the benefit of the visitation of graves, the *'ulamā'* of the Ḥanbalī school of thought in general and Ibn Taymiyya in particular, denied this a benefit. According to Siwāsī, Ibn Taymiyya, by denouncing this practice as non-Islamic, in fact went astray and therefore his book on the subject was refuted by the *'ulamā'* of his own time. After careful investigation, the *'ulamā'* of the time reached the conclusion that Ibn Taymiyya must be killed and they issued a *fatwā*, but Ibn Taymiyya by asking for forgiveness and repentance, and by admitting his ignorance just managed to escape with his life.[130]

According to Siwāsī, Qurṭubī mentions that some saints (*awliyā'*) who attained spiritual light and power had access thereby to knowledge of what their relatives and children were doing. If they found them happy, they were too; if they found them distressed, they shared the same feelings. He cites an example from Ibn 'Arabī whose influence upon the author was great.[131] Siwāsī has no doubt that it is possible to obtain abundance through the graves of respected people (*kibār*) and he admits having received this. *Kibār*

---

130. The author unfortunately does not make any reference to any source. It seems he heard something about Ibn Taymiyya, but it was not true.

131. Naẓmī Meḥmed, *Hadiyyāt al-Ikhwān*, fol. 48b.

are those whom the Qur'ān mentions (16/97). "Whoever works righteousness, man or woman, and has faith, verily to him will we give a new life, a life that is good and pure, and we will bestow on such their reward according to the best of their actions." According to Siwāsī, such people are the ones who have reached the stage (maqām) of Baqā billāh and have eternal life. These are the people who can attain the highest stages (maqāms). According to Siwāsī, however, any individual who does not have this sort of experience in his life, surely, could refute it, which is not unusual. Believing in this kind of experience is the result of a light (nūr) which is given by Allah, as it is pointed out in the Qur'ān. "...... And he for whom Allah hath not appointed light, for him there is no light." (24/40) "Hence those who had not received this light, naturally may not attain this knowledge."[132]

The view of the Qāḍī-zādelis is expressed in the works of both Qāḍī-zāde and Üsṭüwānī.

In his work Irshād al-'Uqūl, Qāḍī-zāde discusses the question of the veneration of the Ṣūfī tombs, by summarising the work of Ibn Qayyim, Ighāthāt al-Lahfān.[133] After explaining the nature of the problem, Qāḍī-zāde mentions

---

132. Siwāsī, Durar al-'aqā'id, fols. 59a-b.

133. Irshād al'Uqūl, fol. 173a; cf. Ibn Qayyim, Ighāthat al-Lāhfān, I, p. 208.

the Prophet's rejection of the idea of considering the tombs of holy and pious people and 'ulamā' as masjīd and he cites certain ḥadīth relevant to this issue, including the following ḥadīth from the Prophet:

> "O my Allah do not make my grave a place of worship and prayer, Allah's anger (ghaḍab) will be strong upon the people who take the graves of their prophets as a place of worship."

The author considers this sort of practice as the practice of infidels and compares it with pre-Islamic Arab customs.

Qāḍī-zāde then turns to the question of building tombs over the graves where people might offer prayers, light candles and sacrifice animals. He rejects this practice on the basis of a tradition which is reported by Muslim. In Qāḍī-zāde's view these practices are the practices of idolators, not Muslims.[134]

Qāḍī-zāde then gives examples from the practice of the Companions which illustrate their careful observance of the sunna of the Prophet. He bemoans the fact that the people of his own time have strayed far from the sunna and Sharī'a and indulged in bid'a, uncanonical practices and beliefs. He attributes this lapse to the people's ignorance of the concept of Tawḥīd. In this connection, he refers to the tradition "When you are in difficulty in your affairs seek help from the people of the grave." Qāḍī-zāde continues, "This is an example of their fabricated traditions and it is contrary to the Qur'ān and sound

---

134. Fol. 174a.

traditions. Allah, in His open book, teaches us 'Thee do we worship, and thine aid we seek' so, how should we seek help from anyone other than Him?"[135]

Üsṭüwānī Meḥmed Ef. also expressed his opinion on this issue in his book Kitāb-ı Üsṭüwānī, which is a collection of his discourses. He treats the issue under the section shirk, which is subdivided into six types of which the third type is entitled "Shirk-i Taqrībī". The author begins the section by describing the shirk of the people of Noah and the Quraysh. According to him, those people believed that Allah is a supreme being, while human beings in comparison to this high and supreme being have a lowly position which presents them from addressing God directly. They therefore felt the necessity and the importance of having intermediaries through whose intercession they could pray to Allah. Hence, instead of praying directly to God, they offered prayers and their requests to those people whom they considered to be the friends of God (awliyā'), assuming that praying to His friends was the equivalent of praying to God himself. This kind of belief led men to seek help from trees, graves, stones, tombs and the like. Furthermore, in order to have children, cures for their diseases and illnesses, they offered prayers, sacrifices and gifts. These are nothing but an act of shirk. True believers

---

135. Fol. 176a.

must avoid performing this kind of non-Islamic practice.[136]

As can be seen from the discussion above, both sides, the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs, have a completely different approach to the issue of the visitation of graves and they cannot be reconciled.

The Qāḍī-zādelis' view is similar to that of previous 'ulamā'. Particularly, Üsṭüwānī's treatment of the problem gives the impression that he is very much under the influence of Ibn Taymiyya.[137] He is, therefore, very direct and uncompromising.

On the other hand, Siwāsī, as the leader of the opposition, presents the Ṣūfī view, but in an ambiguous manner. He bases his opinions on traditions which do not seem authentic at all or at least do not appear in the authentic collections of ḥadīth.

---

136. M. Üstüwānī, Kitāb-ı Üsṭüwānī, fols. 76a-b.

137. Compare Üsṭüwānī's views with Ibn Taymiyya's al-Tawassul wa'l-wasila, pp. 23-4.

Shaking Hands, Mutual Embrace and Bowing[138]

Although neither the Ṣūfīs nor the Qāḍī-zādelis were against shaking hands in principle, there was a disagreement between these two groups about bowing, and when this should be performed.

Concerning the issue, there is, as far as the available sources are concerned, no reference to this topic by the Ṣūfīs. On the other hand, the fullest treatment of this topic is provided by Wānī. A section of his work on this subject is therefore translated below.

Wānī discusses this issue under the heading "Fī bayān karāhāt al-muṣafāha fī ba'ḍ al-awqāt wa'l-mu'ānaqat wa'l-naẓar ilā al-amrād."[139] He begins the discussion by giving examples from the practices and sayings of the Prophet, and he mentions the following tradition:

> "When two Muslims meet and shake hands with one another, their sins will be dropped like the dry leaves of a tree drop from the tree."[140]

In his commentary on Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Nawawī (d. 1287)[141]

---

138. Balance, pp. 47-49.

139. There is nothing by Qāḍī-zāde and Üsṭüwānī; Wānī Muḥyi'l-sunna wa mumīt al-bid'a, fol, 22a-24b.

140. Wānī, op. and loc. cit.

141. Many more traditions can be found in al-Nawawī's al-Adhkār (Beirut, 1971), pp. 206-39; J. Robson, Mishkāb al-Maṣābih, III, pp. 980-2.

states that shaking hands with people after morning prayer (fajr) and afternoon prayer ('asr) has no basis in Islamic practice. And the kissing of the hands of an 'ālim and a just ruler [is permitted] since it is reported that the Companions of the Prophet (may Allah be pleased with them) in fact kissed the limbs of the Prophet (peace be upon him) (aṭrāfī rasūl Allāh). And, also, Abū Bakr kissed the Prophet's forehead when he departed from this world. Abū Yūsuf (d. 798) regarded kissing and embracing between men according to the following tradition that when Ja'far returned from the land of Abyssinia the Prophet (peace be upon him) kissed him on his forehead.[142] It is not permitted to embrace someone who is not dressed; it is agreed that there is no karāha about it. In the case of kissing on cheeks without passion (shahwa) this is also permitted. There is no basis for the practice of some ignorant people who when two of them meet, they kiss their own hands rather than the others'. The practice of kissing the ground before an 'ālim is harām. As Ṣadr al-Shāhid mentions "He who performs this prostration cannot be considered as an infidel (kāfir), because surely he wants to salute the 'ālim. But, on the other hand, al-Sarakhsī (d.1090) making prostration for individual other than Allāh in order to exalt him is an action of kufr.

---

142. Mishkāt, III, p. 182; but this hadith is considered weak by N. al-Bānī, see Mishkāt al-Maṣābiḥ, (Damascus, 1961), II, p. 549.

Ibn Malak in his Kitāb al-Khuṭr wa 'l-ibāḥa reports that Muḥyi 'l-Dīn suggested, "Surely shaking hands is a requisite sunna, but the practice of shaking hands which is usual with people after morning and afternoon prayers has no foundation in the Sharī'a: for that reason, to leave it is better than to practise it." Wānī goes on to say that, "The time for shaking hands is the time of meeting, as is clearly defined in the ḥadīth. Anas said, "we asked, "O Prophet of God, when a man meets his brother (friend) should he bow to him?" He replied, "No"; he asked whether he should embrace and kiss him, and he replied, "No." He asked again whether he should take his hand and shake it, and he replied, "Yes."[143]

In the Durar-Ghurar it is mentioned that there is no harm in performing it (kissing or embracing), because basically shaking hands is a sunna, and the fact that sometimes it is observed but often overdone does not exclude it from being part of shaking hands whose origin is in the law." Wānī continues, "we have already explained the various types of innovations (bid'a) in the first part of Kitāb al-I'tiṣām[144] in detail. Shaking hands with a handsome unbearded young boy must be refrained from. As

---

143. Robson, op. cit., p. 549.

144. In fact no source mentions that the author has a work under this title. Kitāb al-I'tiṣām is a work of Imām al-Shāṭibī.

a matter of fact, to look at him is not permitted (harām), just as we explained in the Kitāb al-Nikāḥ. Our friends mention that everything which is not permitted to look at is not permitted to touch either. In fact, touching is worse than looking. Because surely, to look at a candidate for marriage is permitted, as also in the case of buying and selling. But there is no permission for touching. In this connection Ṭībī (d. 1243),[145] in his chapter on shaking hands and embracing, said, "It is not allowed for men to look at boys with passion; if it is without desire, there is no objection to it." It is therefore ordered that veils should be worn. In the Multaqāt, al-Nāṣirī mentions "As for greeting and looking at boys, when it is without desire, there is no objection to it." Al-Sha'bī mentions in his Kifāya on istiḥsān that "One of the 'ulamā' died and he was seen [by a friend] in a dream with his face darkened. When he was asked the reason for this, the man replied, 'I saw a young boy (ghulām) in a certain place and I looked at him; therefore my face has been burnt in the fire!'" Again, it is reported that one of the 'ābid was seen in a dream and asked, "What has Allāh done to you?" He replied, "I asked for forgiveness for every sin and I was granted this, except for one sin for which I was shy to ask for forgiveness, and I was punished." When he was asked what this sin was,

---

145. Abū 'Alī M. Sharaf al-Dīn al-H. b. 'Alī b. M. al-Ṭībī. GAL, S, II, p. 67.

he replied, "I looked at a young boy with desire." Qāḍī said "I heard imām saying, "For every woman there are two Satans, and with young boys (ghulām) there are eighteen." It is stated in the Tatārkhāniye, in the chapter on karāha, that, "If a young boy is handsome and wants to go out in order to seek knowledge, his parents may prevent him from going out."[146]

In order to give an idea about the Ṣūfī practice one can go to the works on the relationship between the Ṣūfī shaykh and the mürīd. The following quotation may help to understand the Ṣūfī practice:

> "Companionship with the master (ustādh) is by obedience, so it is not really companionship but service. Complete obedience and respect toward the master are required. The master in the midst of his followers is like the prophet in the midst of his community. Junayd once answered a question of one of his disciples and the latter expressed objection to the answer; Junayd then said, 'If you do not believe in my words, dissociate yourselves from me. He should behave toward the shaykh like the Companions with the Prophet in following the ethics of the Qur'ān (Qur'ān 49/1, 49/2 and 24/63)" [147]

---

146. Wānī, op. cit., fol. 24a.

147. Al-Suhrawardī, Kitāb Ādāb al-Murīdīn; tr M. Milson, A Sufi Rule for Novices (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 46-7.

The Supererogatory Prayers of Raghā'ib,[148] Barāt and Laylat al-qadr

The question of whether performing supererogatory prayers in congregation on the nights of Raghā'ib, Barāt and Laylat al-qadr is lawful or unlawful was a controversial issue between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs. Concerning the issue we have only the Qāḍī-zādelis' view, which is expressed by Qāḍī-zāde himself in his two risālas and by Üsṭüwānī.[149] There are no extant writings of the Ṣūfīs on this issue. It is known, however, that

---

148. Raghā'ib: the eve of the first Friday of the month of Rajab, which is believed to be the night on which the Prophet was conceived.
Barāt: Mid Sha'ban night. Prayers offered on that night are believed to be certain of acceptance.
Qadr: the 27th night of the month of Ramaḍān is generally known as Laylat al-qadr. It is believed that on this night the Qur'ān was revealed to the Prophet Muḥammad.

149. Qāḍī-zāde, Risāla qāḍī-zāde, Edinburgh University Library no. 20/1, fol. 104-5; idem, Qāmi'a al-bid'a; Qāḍī-zāde, Risalā qāḍī-zāde, Edinburgh University Library no. 100-119; Üsṭüwānī, Kitāb-ı Usṭüwānī, fol. 108a considers as makrūh.

'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī composed an independent risāla on the legality of performing supererogatory prayers in congregation.[150]

It seems that the problem originated from the question of whether any particular sort of prayer was dictated by the sharī'a or not. Otherwise, as will be seen, both sides agreed on the lawfulness of performing supererogatory prayers in congregation without confining them to a special day or night.

The following is a translation of the relevant section of Qāḍī-zāde's work on supererogatory prayers. Qāḍī-zāde starts his risāla by mentioning the question of al-nafl bi'l-jamā'a on the first Friday night of Rajab and on the night of mid-Sha'bān. He points out that Müftī 'Abd al-Karīm Siwāsī issued a fatwā on this, declaring the legality of performing prayers in congregation during the aforementioned nights.[151] Following this, Qāḍī-zāde first discusses the possibility of praying in congregation in general and narrates the views of sever 'ulamā'. Finally, he accepts the performance of nafl (voluntary or supererogatory prayer) in congregation in accordance with a tradition which was narrated by Ibn 'Abbās.[152]

---

150. 'A. Aḥad Nūrī, Risāla fī jawāz ada'i al-nawāfil bi'l-jamā'a, see OM, I, p. 122.
151. Qāḍī-zāde, Qāmat al-bid'a, fol. 48a-b.
152. Idem, fol. 49b.

The author then presents a long discussion on the definition of *bid'a* (innovation) and its rejection by the Prophet and his Companions, and states the following:

> "The point behind this is that by the prescribed acts of worship which are repeated regularly, Allah Almighty decreed what is sufficient for people; He completed His religion and was pleased with it. If a gathering in addition to that is innovation (*bid'a*), it will be against what Allah has decreed; and any addition to what is already perfect is a defect, a lack of balance, and involves a corruption which the intelligent person will understand without a reminder.
>
> If you ask whether abhorrence of voluntary *nafl* in congregation (كرهة النفل بالجماعة) is prohibitory تحريمية or تنزهية our answer is that it is prohibitory تحريمه." 153

In his other risāla, Qāḍī-zāde writes:

> "They [the innovators] have introduced prayers like *ṣalāt al-raghā'ib*, *ṣalāt al-bdrā't* and *ṣalāt al-qadr*. The *'ulamā'*, however, reject these prayers and have raised objections in other parts of the Muslim world." 154

The author goes on to state clearly that to single out a day or a certain time for performing certain prayers is not permissible:

> "The selection of special times (*takhṣīṣ*) for fasting or praying shows that evil (*fasād*)

---

153. Fol. 50a-b.

154. *Risāla qaḍī-zāde*, fol. 104.

> springs from takhṣīs. If Friday is preferable for prayer, supplication, reciting the Qur'ān, learning, teaching and so on, which are not required on other days, this has caused the misconception that fasting on Friday is better than on the other days, which is not the case." [155]

Qāḍī-zāde is completely against devoting any particular day or night or time for certain prayers, since in his view such a practice would later on acquire the status of a legitimate act of worship in the public view. [156]

The author finally questions the origin of prayer on the night of mid-Sha'bān and says:

> "Some of the jurists say that they are certain that the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his Companions and all the umma never mentioned any merits of this day and night, nor are there any sound reports about this. Others say that there are traditions mentioning its merits, but they do not mention any merits in fasting particularly at that time, in spending the night in devotion, prayers (قيام). As for the traditions which some ignorant preachers mention (and which they have copied from unimportant sources), they are unauthentic according to people who are knowledgeable in tradition. It [this prayer] appeared in Islam in the year 448 [1056], when a man from Nablūs went to Quds (Jerusalem) and began praying on the night of mid-Sha'bān; another joined him, then the others followed and by the time he [the man] had finished his prayer there were many behind him. Hence it spread and was adopted as a sunna until today. As for the Raghā'ib

155. Fol. 58a.

156. Fol. 58b.

prayer on the first Friday of Rajab, it appeared in the Bayt al-Maqdis in Jerusalem, in the year 480 [1087]." 157

It is very clear from Qāḍī-zāde's treatment of this problem that he regards such a practice as a bid'a (innovation), and its roots cannot be traced back to the sunna of the Prophet nor the practices of the Companions. As it is a bid'a, it must be rejected.

To redress the balance, there exist insights into contemporary Ṣūfī practice of all these prayers from the Khalwatī source, the manuscript of Al-Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ghazzī-zāde Sayyid 'Abd al-Laṭīf ibn Muḥammad Es'ad, who, when writing about his grandfather, Shaykh al-Ghazzī, mentions the following:

> Al-Shaykh al-Ghazzī and his followers, on the first Friday night in Rajab used to perform twelve rak'at as Raghā'ib prayers; on the twenty-seventh of Rajab which is the night of mi'rāj (they also performed) four rak'at Tasbīḥ prayers. Moreover in mid Sha'bān, on the night of Barāt (they used to perform) twelve rak'at Barāt prayers. And on the twenty-seventh night of Ramaḍān, after the tarāwīḥ (a supererogatory prayer for Ramaḍān) they performed in congregation varying from eight to twenty), twelve rak'at, prayers for Laylat al-qadr." 158

---

157. Fol. 59a-b.

158. 'A. Laṭīf, op. cit., p. 56.

The Parents of the Prophet

One of the disputed issues between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs concerns the question of whether the parents of the Prophet died as believers or not. According to Kātıb Čelebi[159] the question had been the subject of controversy since the time of Abū Ḥanifa (d. 767) who stated in his work Fiqh al-Akbar that the parents of the were unbelievers when they died.[160] Since then the question had been discussed by several other authors.[161]

The issue was apparently discussed in Ottoman society in the sixteenth century. In particular by Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 1549) who composed a risāla in which he reached the same conclusion as the majority of earlier 'ulamā' who believed that the parents of the Prophet died as unbelievers.[162]

---

159. Kātib Čelebi, Balance, pp. 65-72.

160. A.J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed (London, 1979), pp. 239-40.

161. Kātib Čelebi, Balance, pp. 68-72, gives the names of authors who dealt with the subject, i.e. J. Suyūṭī, al-Rasā'il al-tis'a (India, 1961), pp. 49-61.

162. Al-Ḥalabī, Risāla fī Sharafı Nabiyyinā, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Yazma Bagışlar, no. 2061/2.
Ibn Kemāl, Risāla fī abawayn al-nabī, Millet Library, MS. 'Arabi, 4309/7, ff. 87-91.

In his work _Mīzān al-Ḥaqq_ Kātib Čelebi treats this issue in a detailed and systematic way. He tries to be objective and gives the views of both sides, arguing about them, "in the light of reason and knowledge."[163]

The issue must also have been discussed by the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs in the seventeenth century during their controversy. According to the available sources, there is no extant work by the Qāḍī-zādelis on this subject. They may well have expressed their opinions in their sermons rather than in their writings. Perhaps in order not to provoke the general public they just left this especially sensitive issue untouched. Had they put forward their opinions, these would not have differed from those of al-Ḥalabī.

The Ṣūfī view on the other hand was expounded by the famous ʿAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī, who devoted a _risāla_, entitled, _Ta'dīb al-Mutamarridīn_ to this subject. The author as pointed out earlier, discusses the issue in three parts. Firstly he gives the opinions of scholars who accept the parents of the Prophet as believers, secondly he refutes any contradiction of this view and thirdly he provides a family tree for the Prophet stretching back as far as Abraham. ʿAbd al-Aḥad's arguments are in fact based on the _risāla_ of al-Suyūṭi and on the well-known _tafsīr_, _Mafātiḥ al-Ghayb_ of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī. al-Rāzī in his

---

163. _Balance_, _op._ and _loc. cit._

interpretation of certain verses,[164] asserted that the parents of the Prophet were muwahhidin (those who believed in the oneness of God).[165] ʻAbd al-Aḥad also mentions a work by the muḥaddith Bayhaqī, entitled Kitāb Dalā'il al-Nubūwwa, where the author cites a tradition from the Prophet who mentions his parents as believers.[166]

Following this Abd al-Aḥad discusses two traditions cited in Bukhārī and Muslim, which state that the Prophet's parents were not believers and that they are in hell (al-nār). The first tradition is as follows:

> "Anas (May Allah be pleased with him) narrated from the messenger of God that one day a Bedouin came to the Prophet and asked about the fate of his father and the Prophet replied that he was in hell. The man became very sad and when he was leaving, the Prophet having realized his situation said to him:
> 'Indeed my father and your father are in the fire.'"[167]

In the second tradition the Prophet one day mentions to his Companions that he had asked for forgiveness for his mother. He had not been granted it but was permitted to visit her grave. These two hadīths are used by scholars

164. Baqara, p. 137; Abraham, p. 36.
165. ʻAbd al-Aḥad, Ta'dīb al-Mutamarridīn, İstanbul University Library, MS. Tyz. no. 1738 fol. 5a-b.
166. ʻAbd al-Aḥad, idem.
167. ʻAbd al-Aḥad, idem, fol. 10b.

to assert that the parents of the Prophet were not believers.

'Abd al-Aḥad questions the authenticity of these traditions and argues that they are weak.[168] He then asserts that those people who died during the period of fatra (the absence of a prophet or guidance) will receive different treatment on the day of judgement. Thus he argues that the Prophet's parents died before the mission of the Prophet himself.[169] The author cites many verses and opinions of al-Suyūṭī in order to strengthen his arguments.[170]

He then discusses the work of Abū Ḥanīfa, Fiqh al-Akbar, on the basis of which most of the 'ulamā'[171] said that the Prophet's parents were unbelievers. 'Abd al-Aḥad questions the attribution of the book to Abū Ḥanīfa and argues that Abū Ḥanīfa did not hold this view. In his view there were two books with the same title; the first belonged to Abū Ḥanīfa himself[172] and the second one was a commentary on the first one under the same name by Abū Ḥanīfa Nu'mān b. M. al-Miṣrī who added an article to the original work about the faith of the parents of the

---

168. Idem, fol. 10a-12a.
169. Idem, fol. 12b.
170. Idem, fol. 12b-13b.
171. See Kātib Čelebi, op. and loc. cit.
172. Wensinck, op. cit., pp. 102-3; J. Schacht, "Abū Ḥanīfa" in EI², I, pp. 123-4.

Prophet and considered them as unbelievers. So, people by mistake attributed this work to the famous Abū Ḥanīfa himself.[173] According to ʻAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī, Abū Ḥanīfa did not say anything on this subject. But if Abū Ḥanīfa had considered the parents of the Prophet to be unbelievers, ʻAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī argues that he would have meant kufr-ḥükmī not küfr ḥaqīqī.[174] Therefore he argues that there is no evidence to prove that the parents of the Prophet were unbelievers.

The author later on cites the views of Ibn ʻArabī, Imām Shaʻranī and Tashköprü-zade who consider the interval between Jesus (May Allah's peace be upon him) and the Prophet Muḥammad (Peace be upon him) as the period of fatra. Therefore it cannot be said that those who died in this interval are destined to go to hell.[175]

---

173. Idem, fol. 14a; Mīzān, p. 50.
174. Ibid.
175. Idem, fol. 14b.

The Invoking of Blessings on Prophets and Companions [176]

Although this title may give the impression that the controversy between the Ṣūfīs and the Qāḍī-zādelis on this issue focussed on the legality of the invoking of blessings on prophets and companions, their dispute was in fact completely different in nature. Kātib Čelebi who witnessed the disputes makes the following observation:

> "By this is meant the use of such expressions as 'God Almighty bless him', or 'God bless Muḥammad', when any of the honoured prophets is mentioned, or 'God be pleased with him', when any of the honoured Companions of the Prophet is mentioned.
>
> It has been handed down on the authority of the chosen one of the Imāms of the Faith - God's approval be on them all - that it is a religious duty to say 'Blessings on the Prophet' once in a lifetime. According to the rest, it is only canonically laudable to do so. But some people say that the tradition makes use of the formula compulsory after every mention of the Prophet. There is certainly no unanimity on this point.
>
> Now for the vexed question of the Muezzins' crying in unison 'God bless him and God be pleased with him' during the Khutba."[177]

---

176. On the subject, al-Nawawī, Al-Adhkār (Beirut, 1971), pp. 45-55; al-Shawkānī, Tuḥfāt al-Dhākirīn (Egypt, 1955), pp. 29-38; al-Nabhānī, Sa'ādat al-Dārayn fī 'l-Ṣalāt 'alā Sayyid al-Kawnayn, (Beirut, 1316); Ö.N. Bilmen, Ashab-ı Kiram Hakkında Müslümanların Nezīh I'tikadları (İstanbul, n.d.)

177. Balance, p. 47.

So, the issue of disagreement between the Ṣūfīs and the Qāḍī-zādelis was rather the manner in which the Müedhdhins pronounced the blessings upon the Prophet or on his Companions. It has already been mentioned that the Qāḍī-zādelis were against taghannī. They were also not in favour of pronouncing blessings in a way or in a tune which undermined the original form and turned it into a form of a song or recitation of a poem or qaṣīda. In such a situation the people would pay more attention to the fine voice of the reciter and reflect less on the meaning and importance of the words.

On this disputed issue, there is only ʻAbd al-ʻAḥad Nūrī's article[178] in which he concentrates on the necessity of invoking blessings on prophets and companions in accordance with the Qur'ānic verses and traditions. As he never mentions the time and way of pronouncing the formula, but since they were in favour of taghannī and samāʻ, it may be assumed that he did not oppose the common practice.

On the other hand, the Qāḍī-zādelis openly expressed their concern on this question. In order to explain their viewpoint a translation of the relevant part of Qāḍī-zāde's work Irshād al-ʻUqūl is now given:

> "What the müedhdhins have become accustomed to in our time and have regarded as sunna or

178. ʻAbd al-Aḥād Nūrī, Maw'īẓa-ı Ḥasana, (İstanbul, 1309), pp. 18-26.

even as an obligation(wājib) is the invoking of blessings on prophets and companions while delivering the [Friday] sermon (khutba). This is not supported by the Qur'ān, sunna or the sayings of jurists; indeed, they regarded this as loathsome, even prohibited. The Qur'ān says:

'And when the Qur'ān is recited, give ear to it and pay heed, that ye may obtain mercy.' (7/204) The 'ulamā' hold that this verse is revealed in preaching (khuṭba). Imām al-Baghawī said in Mu'ālim al-Tanzīl that opinions differ about the reason for the revelation of this verse, one group held that it concerns reading in prayer, another group said it was revealed to forbid loud reading after the Imām. Sā'īd b. Jubayr, and 'Aṭa and Mujahīd said that the verse was revealed in connection with the khuṭba. People are ordered to listen to the khātīb when he preaches during the Friday prayer. Others said it was for listening to the two Eids, al-fiṭr and aḍha, and Friday sermons. 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz said it was to order listening to any preacher (wā'iẓ). The first is the correct one; all agree that listening is commanded during the preaching (sermon) of the Imām. Al-Suyūṭī said in his Mukhtaṣar tafsīr al-tanzīl, that the verse was revealed to forbid talking during preaching (the delivering of a sermon), and he mentioned the Qur'ān because it implies it. See how they agree that listening is commanded and no disagreement is reported. In the Tafsīr al-shaykh, after reporting different views for the reasons of revelations, (the author) says

'That they used to talk during the Friday preaching (sermon) and they were forbidden; the most proper meaning is that it includes prayer, the Qur'ān and the khuṭba; the khuṭba is included [there] to show that there is general

benefit (good) (maṣlaḥa) in listening since it involves understanding it and following and acting in accordance with it.'"[179]

---

179. Qāḍī-zāde, Irshād, fols. 171-2.

The Faith of Pharaoh

The question of whether Pharaoh died a believer or an infidel was one of the issues on which the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs expressed different opinions. This issue had been discussed since the thirteenth century, when Ibn 'Arabī considered Pharaoh a believer and asserted that he died pure (ṭāhir), without sin. By his own interpretation of Sūra 22, Ibn 'Arabī[180] contradicted the general view of the 'ulamā'. Thereafter, this topic was much discussed and disputed.

Besides some of the Ṣūfīs, one member of the 'ulamā' subsequently supported Ibn 'Arabī's claim: the Persian Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawwānī (1427-1501) in his independent risāla entitled Īmānī-Fir 'awn[181] in which the author, through speculating on the verses relevant to this issue, reached the same conclusion as Ibn 'Arabī.

In the Ottoman state, in the sixteenth century, the issue was discussed by two scholars both of whom rejected Ibn 'Arabī's claim. The first of these, Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 1549), a severe critic of Ibn 'Arabi, refuted the latter's claims in his risāla, Ni'mat al-Dharī'a[182] and stressed the infidelity of

---

180. Ibn 'Arabī, Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam (The Seals of Wisdom, trs. 'A. al-Tarjumana) (Norwich 1980), p. 187.
181. Īmānī-Fir'awn, (Egypt, 1924)
182. I. al-Ḥalabī, Ni'mat al-Dharī'a fī Nuṣrat al-Sharī'a, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Fatih, 2280.

Pharaoh. The second opponent of Ibn ʻArabī was Ibn Kemāl, a famous Shaykh al-Islām of this century who although he issued a fatwā declaring Ibn ʻArabī a great Ṣūfī master, also pronounced a second fatwā in which he labelled Pharaoh as an infidel.[183]

In regard to this question, however, in the seventeenth century most of the Ṣūfīs still accepted the view of Ibn ʻArabī. One of their number who did not, was a commentator of Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam, al-Shaykh ʻAbd Allāh Bosnawī (1644), who in his sharḥ touched upon the subject several times and finally made the following statement; giving a clear impression of his own uncertainty in this matter:

> "To make a final decision in this respect is a difficult task, so, the final decision belongs to Allah and that will be on the day of judgement."[184]

On this question, Siwāsī, as is reported by his biographer Naẓmī Meḥmed, interpreted Ibn ʻArabī's statement about Pharaoh in three ways and was clearly confused about his own view. He agreed thus:

a) Ibn ʻArabī was a follower of Mālikī madhab in which the faith of a desperate person (yāʼis) is accepted, so

---

183. Ibn Kemāl, Risāla fī redd īmān Firʻawn, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Resid Ef. 985/62, ff. 211-212.

184. A. Bosnawī, Fuṣūṣ (Istanbul, 1290), II, p. 414. For more detail on the question cf. I Fennī, Waḥdat wujūd wa Muḥ yi'l-Dīn ʻArabī (İstanbul, 1928), p. 257.

he is a believer.

b) It is possible that there could have been a plot (dasīsa) concerning the works of Ibn ʻArabī.[185]

c) The birth of Moses is rūḥ (spirit), Firʻawn is nafsī ammara, Aron is ʻaql (reason), Qārūn is Satan... etc.[186]

On the other hand, the view of the Qāḍī-zādelis was expressed by Qāḍī-zāde himself in his book, Irshād al-ʻUqūl. The following passage is a translation of some relevant sections on the issue of the faith of Pharaoh. The author begins his discussion by defining terms such as zandaqa, kāfir and ilḥād, and their implications. Then he follows:

> "The wujūdiyya among the heretics (zanādaqa) and atheists according to what I learned from their teachings, added more heresy to their heresy because they held that Pharaoh left this world pure and void of any sin due to the belief which Allah had granted to him when he was drowning; and this is a denial, a contradiction of what has been confirmed that by clear texts he died a heretic in Sūra 22 of the Qur'ān and many traditions and the consensus of the umma at all times. In this later atrocious (shanīʻ) heresy they contradicted their earlier dreadful heresy that he who claims Godship (ulūhiyya) is right (ṣadīq) in his claim. Since when, according to them, was Pharaoh an infidel so that it could

185. Idem, op. and loc. cit.

186. Naẓmī, Hadiyya , fol. 49a.

be said that he left the world pure by the word of unity which he uttered on drowning?"[187]

---

187. Qāḍī-zāde, *Irshād*, fols. 166-167.

Al-amr bi'l-Ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-Munkar[188]

Al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar was one of the controversial issues between the Ṣūfīs and the Qāḍī-zādelis. It appears that they had different approaches and interpretations of one of the important religious duties in Islām.

Unfortunately, there is only information available to us which provides insights into the Ṣūfī understanding of the question. The view of the Qāḍī-zādelis cannot easily be obtained from their own works since they do not treat the subject under a separate heading, but it would appear that they consider the struggle against the bid'as and uncanonical practices is a al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar.

The view of the Ṣūfīs is expressed by 'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī in his work Durer......[189] The following is the summary of his ideas.

According to Siwāsī, to perform the duty of al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf is a farḍī kifāya in accordance with naṣṣ (Qur'ān and sunna) and ijmā' for every knowledgeable ('ālim) and capable (qādir) individual. Quoting from Mawāqif[190]

---

188. A general introduction into the subject and works on it can be found in Tashköprü-zāde, Miftāḥ al-Sa'āda (İstanbul, 1356), III, pp. 249-54.

189. Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī, Durer...., ff. 53b-6b.

190. The work of Al-Ījī ('Abd al-Raḥmān M. Aḥmad) on theology.

he lists several conditions for an individual who is going to make al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf. The preacher who undertakes this religious duty should believe that the warning which he is going to make will not ceat fitna and fisād; otherwise he should not do it. In this connection the author cites the following verses: "And warn, for warning profiteth believers." (51/55) and also, "Therefore remind (man) for of use is the reminder." (87/9). Moreover, the preacher and those undertaking this duty must not spy on people's affairs, because it is an act of harām according to the Qur'ān and sunna. He adds that the preacher must be partial (gharāḍ). If he warns the people out of selfish desires of his own it becomes an act of sin and his warnings will have no effect on the people.[191]

The author then gives some four or five conditions for performing wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar, by quoting from fatāwā collections and from other works, for example Kashshāf.[192]

Following the conditions for performing wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar the author gives examples from the life of the Prophet and suggests that Muslims must be very tolerant and flexible. They should not be very harsh and merciless to their fellow Muslims. They should also not be too quick to describe a fellow Muslim as kāfir or zindīq

191. Siwāsī, op. cit., fol. 54a.

192. Siwāsī, fol. 54a-b.

because he has made some mistakes. In this connection he is particularly concerned with those who are called *'ālim* or shaykh, and urges them not to behave like ignorant and illiterate people. Siwāsī lays particular emphasis on preachers, their way of preaching and its influence upon the masses. He gives the example of Moses and Fir'awn (Pharaoh) in order to give a clear picture for a preacher and his audiance.[193]

In conclusion, Siwāsī gives many quotations from the early Ṣūfī masters and their experiences in their sermons and audiences.[194] At the end the author cites the following tradition:

> "If in order to please people, one displeases Allah, Allah will be displeased with one. But, on the other hand, if in order to please Allah one displeases the people, Allah will make the people be pleased with one." [195]

Despite the lack of a particular work or *risāla* by the Qāḍī-zādelis on this issue, which might throw light on the Qāḍī-zādelis approach to it, it is likely that the works of Ibn Taymiyya which were a source of inspiration for the Qāḍī-zādelis, represent a fair picture of their views too.

According to Ibn Taymiyya who devoted a *risāla* to

---

193. *Idem*, fol. 54b-55a-b.

194. I.e. Shaqīq of Balkh (d. 810), Muḥyi 'l-Dīn ibn 'Arabi (d. 1240).

195. Siwāsī, *idem*, fol. 55b-56a.

this issue,[196] the duty of al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l-nahy 'an al-munkar is one of the important wajibs or mustehabs, therefore it must be fulfilled by every Muslim.[197] In his opinion al-ma'rūf is every kind of work, practice or act with which Allah and His messenger are pleased, while al-munkar is any sort of practice or belief which Allah and His apostle prohibit believers from doing.[198]

Ibn Taymiyya, too, in order to achieve this duty requires three conditions from those who aim to undertake this responsibility.[199]

---

196. Ibn Taymiyya, al-amr bi'l-ma'ruf wa'l nahy 'an al-munkar (Beirut 1976).
197. Ibn Taymiyya, idem, p. 18.
198. Ibn Taymiyya, idem, p. 17.
199. Ibn Taymiyya, op. and loc. cit.

The Controversy Concerning Muḥyi 'l-Dīn Ibn ʻArabī [200]

According to Naʻīmā and Kātib Čelebi, the question of whether to consider Ibn ʻArabī the greatest Ṣūfī master (al-shaykh al-akbar) or the greatest infidel (al-shaykh al-akfar) was one of the issues on which the Ṣūfīs and their opponents the Qāḍī-zādelis expressed different opinions.[201] As a matter of fact the issue had long been the object of dispute between the two groups. The Qāḍī-zādelis regarded him as an infidel, especially because of the theory of waḥdat al-wujūd, whereas the Ṣūfīs, perhaps as a reaction, placed him in the highest rank of the Ṣūfī hierarchy, and considered him as al-shaykh al-akbar.

A vast corpus of literature was produced about Ibn ʻArabī and there is no doubt that he exerted a great influence on the Ṣūfīs and ṭarīqas (ṭuruq) of Anatolia.[202]

During the controversy which arose between Siwāsī and Qāḍī-zāde in the seventeenth century, it seems that the

---

200. On his biography: A. Ateş, "Muhyid-Dīn ʻArabī" in İA, VIII, pp. 533-55; N. Keklik, Muhyiddin ibnü'l-ʻArabi, Hayatı ve Çevresi (İstanbul, 1966), pp. 56-116.

201. Naʻīmā, op. cit., VI, p. 219; Kātib Čelebi, Mīzān, p. 57.

202. For more bibliographical detail see N. Keklik, el-Futühat el-Mekkiye (İstanbul, 1974), pp. IV-XIII.

dispute over Ibn 'Arabī was still alive among the members of Ottoman society. Neither the Ṣūfīs of this period nor the Qāḍī-zādelis wrote any particular risāla on this question, but it is not difficult to pinpoint what the Ṣūfīs' attitude towards Ibn 'Arabī was. As already mentioned, Siwāsī wrote a commentary on one of the works of Ibn 'Arabī, which he entitled, Tarjuma-i risāla-i shaykh al-akbar [203] and more generally Siwāsī refers to Ibn 'Arabī as al-shaykh al-akbar.[204] The other Ṣūfīs of this period, such as 'Abd Allāh Bosnawī, Ismā'īl Rusūkhī and Naẓmī Meḥmed, also regarded Ibn 'Arabī as al shaykh al-akbar. [205]

On the other hand, there are no specific references in the works of the Qāḍī-zādelis to Ibn 'Arabī but the leader of the movement, Qāḍī-zāde, in his work Irshād al-'Uqūl makes a very severe attack on the wujūdiyya (waḥdat

---

203. Cf. works of Siwāsī, p. 185.

204. See Siwāsī, Durer.... fol. 55b.

205. 'Abd Allāh Bosnawī, Tajalliyāt 'Arā'is al-nuṣūṣ fī minaṣṣāt ḥikam al-Fuṣuṣ (İstanbul, 1290), pp.
The author praises Muḥyi'l-Dīn 'Arabī with titles such as, Quṭb al-Muḥaqqīn, wa ghawth al-Muwāḥḥidīn......
wārith 'ulūm nebiyyi 'Arabī p. (1)
I. Rusūkhī, Kitāb Minhāj al-Fuqarā' (İstanbul, 1256),. pp. 38, 89; Naẓmī Meḥmed, Hadiyyat al-Ikhwān, fol. 48b.

al-wujūd). Without giving a full discussion of the theory of wahdat al-wujūd, he explains it in a simple and brief manner:

> "According to them [the Ṣūfīs] there is only wujūd al-mutlaq and other things (ashyā') have no real existence (haqīqa). In their view there is no halāl and harām nor is there ahkām or punishment ('adhāb) or 'iqāb. In their opinion everything is imagination (khayāl) and mirage (sirāb). Then they [the wujūdiyya] contradict themselves; the punishment ('adhāb) in the hereafter is real; contrary to their interpretation of the word ('adhāb), they take the word from the roots of العَذْب (sweet, tasty) and say that the people of the fire are in hell like the fish in the water blessed and happy. [206]

Qāḍī-zāde goes on to say that in the opinion of the wujūdiyya there is no distinction between the creator and created, worshipped and worshipper. In this, Qāḍī-zāde claims that they are in dalāla and inkār and adds that they are zindīq. [207] Qāḍī-zāde states that, "the basic of Islam is the knowledge of Allah (ma'rifat Allah). One may infer His existence from the existence of creation." [208] Qāḍī-zāde dwells on this point by giving more examples in order to show how far the followers of this theory have gone astray. [209]

---

206. Qāḍī-zāde, idem, fol. 161-2a.
207. Idem, fol. 162b.
208. Idem, ibid.
209. Idem, fol. 163a.

Although Qāḍī-zāde regards the followers and advocates of the theory of _wujūdiyya_ as _zindiqs_, he never overtly mentions the name of the originator of this theory, Ibn ʿArabī, nor does he refer to him as the _shaykh al-akfar_ or by any other names or titles. Possibly this reticence sprang from the popularity which Qāḍī-zāde knew Ibn ʿArabī enjoyed among the ruling class and with the Sulṭān himself.

CHAPTER VIII

ORTHODOXY, THE OTTOMANS AND THE QĀḌĪ-ZĀDELIS

Before discussing the question of orthodoxy among the Ottomans in the seventeenth century, it is important to define orthodoxy and more especially the Islamic conception of orthodoxy.

According to the _Oxford English Dictionary_ orthodoxy is "the quality or character of being orthodox; beliefs in or agreement with what is, or is currently held to be right."[1] On the other hand, the _Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics_ defines orthodoxy more strictly as follows: "Orthodoxy in religion is concerned with doctrine or belief, with the intellectual element in spiritual life. It is opinion raised to its highest power and dignity. But, since religion embraces feeling and activity as well as thought, orthodoxy becomes an inadequate criterion of its worth apart from right experience and right conduct."[2]

From these two definitions one may assert that orthodoxy is right belief and conduct in accordance with what is accepted to be right or correct by the authority or authorities of a particular faith or religion. Strictly speaking, in Islam it is the authority of the Prophet which defined what constitutes correct doctrine. According to the Prophet, true Islam is "Clinging to _Qur'ān_ and _sunna_

---

1. _The Oxford English Dictionary_ (Oxford, 1970), VII, p. 213.
2. W.A. Curtis, "Orthodoxy" in _ERE_ (Edinburgh, 1971), IX, p. 570.

alone," or "Confining oneself to Qur'ān and sunna."[3]

A number of Western and Muslim scholars have tackled the definition of Islamic orthodoxy. Montgomery Watt defines orthodoxy generally as "sound or correct intellectual belief", which he rightly suggests is out of place in an Islamic context.[4] He then goes on to say:

> "Indeed Islam has had no machinery comparable to the Ecumenical Councils of the Christian Church which would say authoritatively what constitutes 'right doctrine'. Nevertheless by the typically Islamic process of ijmā' or consensus a wide area of agreement was eventually reached (after the year 1000), and to this the term 'orthodoxy' might be applied were it not for the fact that the agreement was concerned more with matters of practice than of doctrine in the strict sense; 'sunnism' and 'sunnite' are more accurate. Even at the death of al-Ash'arī in 935, though Ḥanafites, Ḥanbalites and Ash'arites were moving closer together doctrinally, they were not prepared to recognize one another as fellow-sunnites."[5]

It is unfortunately unclear from this passage what the author's definition of Islamic orthodoxy is.

---

3. Cf. A.J. Wensinck, Handbook of Muhammadan Traditions (Leiden, 1927), 130A, 223A.
4. W.M. Montgomery Watt, The Formative Period of Islamic Thought (Edinburgh, 1973), p. 5.
5. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

Other Western scholars, on the other hand, have interpreted the term orthodoxy in an Islamic context as being synonymous with Sunnism, as represented by the four main madhhabs, and they draw a distinction between Sunnism and Shīʿism. Amongst such scholars may be included Goldziher,[6] Macdonald,[7] Schacht[8] and Gibb.[9]

Bernard Lewis appears to have been the first scholar to dissent from the definition of Islamic orthodoxy as being Sunnism.[10] He defines orthodoxy in the Islamic context as follows:

> "The nearest Islamic equivalent to orthodoxy is the Sunna, the custom and practice of the Prophet, his companions, and his immediate successors, as preserved by the historic memory of the community as a whole."[11]

---

6. I. Goldziher, The Ẓāhirīs, their doctrine and their history (trs. ed. W. Behn) (Leiden, 1971), pp. 3, 36, 41, 91; Idem, Muslim Studies, I, pp. 97, 103.
7. B. Macdonald, Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory (London 1915), p. 19.
8. J. Schacht, Introduction to Islamic Law (Oxford, 1979), p. 16.
9. H.A.R. Gibb, Islam (Muhammadanism) (Oxford, 1978), pp. 73-85.
10. B. Lewis, Islam; Religion and Society (London, 1979), p. XVII
11. Ibid., p. XIX

Thus, Lewis defines orthodoxy as early Islam in its pure form as practised in accordance with the Qur'ān and sunna by the Prophet, his Companions and immediate successors.

This view is upheld by H.A. Wolfson who, expanding on Lewis' definition, says:

> "The first stage was dominated by those called al-salaf, literally 'the predecessors', a term applied to the 'companions of Muhammad' (al-ṣaḥāba) and those who came after the companions, called 'the followers' (al-tābi'ūn). What these salaf agreed upon is taken to constitute that which may be called the good old-time religion of Islam. We shall refer to the salaf either as early Muslims or as the followers of early Islam or simply as orthodox Islam or the orthodox Muslims, all as is required by the context."[12]

On the other hand, Fazlur Rahman takes a different view and says:

> "It is indeed a curious and striking fact about the religious history of Islam that at each critical point of its career the force that comes to the forefront and takes over the situation is not the then formalized established 'orthodoxy' but rather something that presents itself at every juncture as the 'raw material' of the orthodoxy subsequently to be formed. In itself this force is something nondescript and for want of a better designation is called by

---

12. H.A. Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Kalam (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1976), p. 3.

> such terms as 'Ahl al-Ḥadīth' or 'Ahl al-Sunna' by Muslims themselves and identified as 'conservative' or 'orthodox' by modern Western scholars. But the Ahl al-Ḥadīth or the Ahl al-Sunna is not the name of any particular group, sect or party; and if there is an 'orthodoxy' or 'conservatism', this is surely the one that is in ascendancy at the point of time concerned."[13]

Once again, this definition is rather vague. The author even expresses doubts about the existence of orthodoxy in Islam at all. He does not venture to define who the ahl al-ḥadīth or ahl al-sunna are. In this very nebulous description he seems to distinguish two forms of "orthodoxy"; what may be loosely described as a de facto "formalised established orthodoxy" and another kind of orthodoxy which is to be formed in every age by the ahl al-ḥadīth or ahl al-sunna (whoever they may be). This latter group are a conservative force, surely to be identified with these groups in Islām who at significant moments advocate a return to the principles of the Qur'ān and sunna.

Muslims believe that Islam in its pristine form, both as a way of life and system of government, was not followed fully after the period of the four Rightly Guided Caliphs, except during the period of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz. Social, political and moral deviations from this ideal

---

13. F. Rahman, Islam (Chicago, 1979), p. 111.

were responsible for the periodic emergence of groups of Muslims who advocated a return to the society of early Islām which was based on the Qur'ān and sunna and was free from bid'as and heresies. These Muslims saw themselves as the real representatives of Islamic orthodoxy and were identified as ahl al-ḥadīth or ahl al-āthār or Salafiyya. It is in a context such as this that the efforts of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Qayyim, Birgiwī, the Qāḍī-zādelis and Wahhābīs should be viewed and evaluated.

Before embarking on a discussion of Islamic orthodoxy among the Ottomans their connection with Islam and its place in their society and system of government will first be examined.

The Ottomans were followers of the Ḥanafī interpretation of Islamic law and Māturīdī's exposition of Islamic theology.[14] It should however be pointed out here that

---

14. W. Madelung, "The Spread of Māturīdism and the Turks" in Actas Do IV Congresso de estudes Arabes e Islāmicos Coimbra - Lisboa 1968 (Leiden, 1971), p. 140. According to Schacht,(i) the Turks always favoured the Ḥanafite school of thought, perhaps because of its attitude towards ijmā', which allowed them to be more tolerant and flexible in legal matters. This view is also held by Inalcik, who attributes the choice of the Ḥanafite madhhab to "the desire of the Turkish rulers to retain as much freedom as possible in their political and executive authority, and it was at the

although the Ottoman state adopted the Ḥanafite school of thought as its official madhhab, the other schools of thought were tolerated in their domains.[15]

Generally speaking,[15a] the Ottoman rulers, the members of the 'ilmiyye and the representatives of the tekke, the Ṣūfīs, held a tolerant and flexible attitude towards science, Ṣūfism and art. Through the influence of al-Ghazālī, Ṣūfism was allowed to flourish in the Ottoman state and was encouraged by rulers, officials, rich pious Muslims and the 'ulamā' in general, who felt deep respect and admiration for the Ṣūfī leaders and built tekkes, waqfs and other institutions. This support was offered the Ṣūfīs, so long as the ṭarīqas stayed within the framework of the Ottoman polity. If, on the other hand, the ṭarīqas and their leaders had extreme political ambitions and militant commitments to other ideologies then they were not tolerated. They were considered to be dangerous to the community and the state at large, and

---

same time one of the main factors giving Turkish societies a distinctive social and cultural character within the Islamic world."(ii) Doubts may be raised about the validity of these arguments.

(i) Schacht, An Introduction to Islamic Law (Oxford, 1979), p. 89.

(ii) İnalcık, Empire, p. 181.

15. Gibb-Bowen, op. cit., I, p. 22.

15a. The points made in pages 411-3 have been covered in more detail in Ch. III.

were suppressed and punished. In this connection Berkes makes the following remarks:

> "The majority of the ṭarikas, however, avoided open antinomianism and maintained their position within the framework of the Ottoman polity. They adopted quietism or indifferentism on theological-political matters and were inclined more and more to ritualism and incantation or to poetry and art. This tendency not only safeguarded their existence, but also added prestige and enhanced their popularity among various classes of society, particularly among the artisans, the military and the bureaucracy."[16]

A generally good relationship between the state, the ʿulamāʾ and the Ṣūfīs in fact contributed greatly to the success of the Ottoman state from the early years of its foundation until the height of its power. Official recognition and encouragement of the ṭarīqas and their leaders by the rulers and the ʿulamāʾ no doubt played an important role in their popularity in every part of the society. In turn the ṭarīqa leaders, with their overwhelming influence and power over the masses in their own area, contributed to the maintenance of law and order and stability. This support was always needed and appreciated by the rulers.

As we have already seen, it was not uncommon for the Ottoman ʿulamāʾ to associate themselves with a ṭarīqa and

---

16. N. Berkes, "Iṣlāḥ" in EI², IV, p. 167.

at the same time to hold positions in the *'ilmiyye*. The rulers also, both as a result of their early education and as government policy, maintained a tolerant and flexible attitude towards the Ṣūfīs. This created a very close link between the state and the *ṭarīqas*. Both benefited from this mutual cooperation and friendship, which was vital for the durability of Ottoman society.

With regard to this point, Berkes writes as follows:

> "The *ṭarika* thus represented another example of the union between religion and state, attracting the participation not only of the *'ulamā'* but also high ranking statesmen, often even of rulers themselves. Furthermore, the Ottoman state succeeded, in the later period, in making the *ṭarikas* a semi-official pillar of the state by recognizing the *mashāyikh* alongside the *'ulamā'* in various ceremonial affairs."[17]

It is important, however, to stress that the theories of Ibn 'Arabī (d. 1240) dominated and pervaded the Ottoman intellectual scene. The official *'ulamā'* and their educational institutions were the centre from which the theory of *waḥdat al-wujūd* was propagated and spread. The works and efforts of prominent Ṣūfīs such as Jalāl al-Dīn, Ṣadr al-Qonawī, Yūnus Emre and Dāwud of Qayṣeri brought this theory to the masses. Moreover, the particular *ṭarīqas*, such as Mawlawiyya and Bayrāmiyya, which became established for the first time in Anatolia were based on

---

17. Berkes, *op.* and *loc. cit.*

the theory of wahdat al-wujūd.[17a]

By the beginning of the sixteenth century there was a reaction to this and an anti-Ṣūfī tendency began to develop among some Ottoman intellectuals and scholars. Such developments grew stronger by the mid-sixteenth century, and theories, practices and some of the prominent figures amongst the Ṣūfīs came under severe criticism from official and independent scholars, like al-Ḥalabī, Birgiwī, Abū 'l-Su'ūd, Ibn Kemāl and Čiwi-zāde. Meḥmed Birgiwī (d. 1573) appears to have been a prominent opponent of bid'as.[18]

In some respects, the Ottomans may be considered "orthodox". By following the Ḥanafite madhhab and defending the ahl al-sunna wa'l-jamā'a against heretical beliefs both inside and outside the Ottoman empire they were in fact within the framework of "orthodoxy." On the other hand, if a stricter definition of orthodoxy is applied to them, they cannot be considered as the real representatives of Islamic orthodoxy, especially since they used qānūns and other supplementary laws in their administration. Indeed, the Ottoman rulers, and the members of the 'ilmiyye, the 'ulamā', by allowing uncanonical practices and the application of supplementary laws and qānūns, and also by associating themselves with the Ṣūfī orders and encouraging Ṣūfī leaders, acted as the defenders of Sunnism and protectors of Ottoman institutions rather than ideal Islam. Moreover, from the establishment

17a A. Ateş, 'Ibn al-'Arabi' in EI², III, p. 711.
18. See chapter III. pp. 98-101, 126-2.

of the Ottoman state, the Ottoman 'ulamā' took an active part in the administration of the state. The wide range of their functions brought them into close contact with the state itself; as a result they lost their independence, became identified with the state itself and defended its institutions and values.

As pointed out earlier, in the sixteenth century there was an increasing anti-Ṣūfī tendency in Ottoman society. Several independent and some official scholars took a negative attitude towards some Ṣūfī practices and certain Ṣūfī masters.[18a] In the course of time, the number of controversial issues increased and the gap between the Ṣūfīs and a certain group of 'ulamā' enlarged day by day, until it erupted into open hostility and hatred in the time of Qāḍī-zāde and his followers.

In such a situation the winner appears to be the state, as Berkes says:

> "The 'ulamā' and the mashāyikh accused each other of such innovations which the state, perhaps the real culprit, took the occasion to tighten its grip upon both.
>
> However, no basic change in the traditional outlook of the 'ulamā' and the Ṣūfī orders took place before the challenge of the modern world, although one should not conclude that the 'ulamā' always took a negative attitude toward innovations. Because of their vested interest in the maintenance of the Ottoman system, their attitude to change was dictated by their principle of maṣlaḥa, political expediency. Only in a few cases did the 'ulamā' openly oppose the government policies and attempts at reform. In periods of tension the

18a. Cf. pp. 98-101, above.

> *'ulamā'* turned against the Ṣūfīs rather than against the state; under their attacks, the *ṭarikas* became more docile."[19]

As has been demonstrated in this thesis, the Qāḍī-zādelis, who were strongly influenced by Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Qayyim and Birgiwī, as well as other opponents of *bid'as*, were firmly within the *salafiyya* tradition, advocating as they did a return to the *Qur'ān*, *sunna* and the practices of the *Aṣḥāb*. The stand taken by them was in fact unusual in Ottoman history. In order to achieve their aim the Qāḍī-zādelis tried to gain the support of both the Sulṭān and the people. With the Sulṭān they achieved a certain success for a short period and united with him in his hostility towards coffee and tobacco, which they considered as *bid'as*. It would appear that with the common people the Qāḍī-zādelis made only a limited impact, in spite of their sermons, writings and study. This is perhaps not surprising in a society long accustomed to Ṣūfism and *bid'as*. When the Qāḍī-zādelis did gain some followers it was from among the *medrese* students, the lower ranks of the Palace officials and traders. The most significant area of failure for the Qāḍī-zādelis was that of the *'ilmiyye*. As preachers they belonged to the lower grades of this institution and their contact with the higher *'ulamā'* was probably limited.

---

19. Berkes, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-8.

Certain factors contributed especially to the overall failure of the Qāḍī-zāde movement. The Qāḍī-zādelis did not manage to make their claims very clear in the public mind through their sermons, partly perhaps because some of them would have offended popular religious sensitivities*, while others were so abstruse as to be beyond the comprehension of the masses. Moreover, the writings of the Qāḍī-zādelis were generally in Arabic, in accordance with the practice of the *'ulamā'*, and they therefore appealed to the intellectual élite rather than to the common people.

However, as already pointed out, the Qāḍī-zādelis failed to establish a good relationship with the *'ilmiyye*, and apart from the *sūkhtes* most of the followers of the Qāḍī-zādelis were illiterate. Above all, it would appear that the Qāḍī-zādelis did not have a sufficiently well planned and organised programme of reforms. This lack of a well-defined approach meant that except for the leaders of the movement and a few other senior figures most of their followers were not clear about the concepts which they were defending. Far from convincing their opponents of the validity of their views, they resorted to violence, openly attacked the Ṣūfī *tekkes* and demolished them.

* e.g. the claim that the parents of the Prophet died unbelievers.

The Relationship between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the ʿUlamāʾ

The Qāḍī-zādelis, as shown above, were a group of preachers who devoted themselves to the abolition of *bidʿas* and to a return to a pure form of Islām. On the other hand, the *ʿulamāʾ*, particularly in the higher echelons, were an integral part of Ottoman government. In short, they were part of the system. Their involvement in bribery, corruption, inefficiency and lower standards was known to the Qāḍī-zādelis as well as to others. Many of the *ʿulamāʾ* held positions which they did not deserve, as Qāḍī-zāde explained in his *qaṣīda*. They were ambitious for fame and promotion and desired and enjoyed worldly goods and an extravagant life-style. Above all, they were cut off from the public and lived in ivory towers. To the Qāḍī-zādelis, the fact that the *ʿulamāʾ* were sympathetic to the Ṣūfīs, and in many cases had connections with one of the *ṭarīqas*, was the last straw.

The Qāḍī-zādelis' attitude towards the *ʿulamāʾ* is not made explicit in their writings, (with the exception of QZ's *qaṣīda*) but it is certain that their attitude was not positive, for the reasons outlined above. Above all, it was the attitude of the *ʿulamāʾ* to the Ṣūfīs which the Qāḍī-zādelis considered reprehensible. No doubt the Qāḍī-zādelis held the *ʿulamāʾ* responsible for the widespread *bidʿas* amongst the public in general and the Ṣūfīs in particular. *Fatwās* from the *ʿulamāʾ* in favour of the Ṣūfīs encouraged the Ṣūfīs to maintain their innovatory practices and beliefs, and the tolerant and flexible attitude of the *ʿulamāʾ* towards

tobacco and coffee-drinking must have enraged the Qāḍī-zādelis. This close relationship between the Ṣūfīs and the 'ulamā' may well have been the reason why the Qāḍī-zādelis did not attempt to establish a good relationship with the higher 'ulamā'.

On the other hand, the 'ulamā' may well have had their reasons for not supporting or taking part in the activities of the Qāḍī-zādelis. Certainly, the position they adopted vis-à-vis the Qāḍī-zādelis is very ambiguous. As a group of learned people they adopted a policy of indifference and silence. They neither supported the Qāḍī-zādelis nor did they officially take a stand against them unless it was requested of them by the state.

In any case, as an institution they were not strong enough to refute the claims of the Qāḍī-zādelis, as they had been in the sixteenth century. When Birgiwī had attacked certain uncanonical state practices he received a vigorous response from Abu 'l-Su'ūd. When al-Ḥalabī had objected to Ibn 'Arabī he was defended by Ibn Kemāl. When, on the other hand, Qāḍī-zāde declared that the smoking of tobacco was ḥarām, around 1633, the Shaykh al-Islām at that time, although he considered tobacco illegal, did not make his view known either by a fatwā or a risāla.[20]

At the height of the power of the Qāḍī-zādelis, the silence of the 'ulamā' is more understandable. The 'ulamā' were well aware of the influence and the power of the Qāḍī-zādelis among the Palace aghas, servants, and above all with the Sulṭāns. At this point, too, the Qāḍī-zādelis had a strong say in promotions and appointments

20. Cf. pp. 332-33, above.

and any opposition to them might have resulted in dismissal or exile.

Na'īmā is very biased against the Qāḍī-zādelis in his narrative but there is a common thread throughout his anecdotes about them. He stresses their hypocrisy and insincerity, and examples of these qualities are found in stories which he attributes to members of the 'ulamā'. According to Na'īmā, the Qāḍī-zādelis preached against uncanonical practices, whilst being involved in sinful activities themselves.

Only on one occasion, however, was a general pronouncement made by the 'ulamā' as a body about the Qāḍī-zādelis. Following the confrontation between the Qāḍī-zādelis and their opponents in the Fātiḥ Mosque in September 1656, the Grand Vizier of the time, Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha, summoned the 'ulamā' and consulted their opinions about the claims of the Qāḍī-zādelis. The 'ulamā' apparently without any hesitation declared the claims of the Qāḍī-zādelis to be false and accused them of having created disunity and discord within Ottoman society.[21]

In spite of opposition from the official 'ulamā', the Qāḍī-zādelis managed to carry out their activities in the Ottoman capital and to gather around themselves a good number of followers who blindly devoted themselves to their cause. For a period of over fifty years the Qāḍī-zādelis appeared as a new group in Ottoman society with their own interpretations, approach and ideals. They soon lapsed into bigotry, fanaticism and violence. Had

21. Cf. p. 264, above.

they applied different methods of preaching their ideas, they might have been more successful in their movement. Extremism is always dangerous and often ends in failure.

<u>The Relationship between the Qāḍī-zādelis and the Ṣūfīs</u>

The Qāḍī-zādelis were not against a Ṣūfī way of life as practised by the great Ṣūfīs of the past such as Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Junayd al-Baghdādī, and Bāyazīd al-Bisṭāmī and the like, but they were against the Ṣūfism which existed in their own time in Ottoman society. In their view, these Ottoman Ṣūfīs were not real Ṣūfīs; they were people of innovations, whose practices and some of whose beliefs were incompatible with the *sharī'a*. So, as a people of *iṣlāḥ* who dedicated themselves to bringing about changes in the society in accordance with the *Qur'ān* and *sunna*, the Qāḍī-zādelis felt it was a religious duty to prevent the Ṣūfīs from continuing with these practices and activities. They could easily justify their actions by the tradition which urges every Muslim who sees a bad action or practice to change it either by hand, if not by persuasion; or failing that, by disapproval in his heart.

The Qāḍī-zādelis followed the method enjoined in this tradition. They began by attacking the Ṣūfīs in their sermons and in their writings, and when they felt that they had failed in their attempts they resorted to attacking and demolishing the *tekkes* as well as beating up the Ṣūfīs. In the view of the Qāḍī-zādelis, the Ṣūfīs were

zindiqs, kāfirs and ahl al-bid'a. It was the plan of the Qāḍī-zādelis when they launched their final attack to ask the Ṣūfīs to renew their faith and, if they refused, to kill them.

One point should be stressed here, namely that the Qāḍī-zādelis focussed their attention mainly on particular Ṣūfī orders such as the Mawlawiyya, the Khalwatiyya and its branches. The reason for this must have been the popularity which these orders enjoyed amongst the people and particularly amongst the intellectual élite. Moreover, as pointed out by Kissling, most of the posts amongst the 'ulamā' and the government were held either by Khalwati sympathisers or by actual members of this order.[22] It is not inconceivable that the Qāḍī-zādelis were unable to advance within the 'ilmiyye because of the Khalwatis and their associates. If this theory is true, it would give the Qāḍī-zādelis a more concrete cause for their violent attacks on the Ṣūfīs.

When they attempted to win public support for their cause, the Qāḍī-zādelis placed much blame upon the Ṣūfīs for the social, economic and moral problems which were confronting Ottoman society. Indeed, the Qāḍī-zādelis presented this whole situation as the displeasure of Allah at bid'as and religious laxity which they blamed squarely on the Ṣūfīs.[22a]

22. Cf. p.104, above.

22a Cf. pp.259-61, above.

Why did the Qāḍī-zādelis avoid direct confrontation with the government and the 'ulamā'? Why did they attack the Ṣūfīs? It could be argued that their aims were genuinely restricted to attacks on the Ṣūfīs. Alternatively, it could well be that the Qāḍī-zādelis knew that any attack on the government would bring them nothing but harm. So, in this case, they were using the Ṣūfīs as a scapegoat to cover up their real intentions which were to make fundamental changes in the Ottoman state.

As might be expected, the Ṣūfīs did not retaliate in kind and resort to violence, as their opponents did. As usual, the Ṣūfīs preferred defence rather than attack. They did not, however, easily give up in their struggle against the Qāḍī-zādelis. Having realized the low intellectual level of the Qāḍī-zādelis, the Ṣūfīs concentrated all their attention on shaking the confidence of the Qāḍī-zādelis in the work al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya, which was considered a handbook and source of inspiration by the Qāḍī-zādelis. In this attempt the Ṣūfīs were successful. In their attacks on the Qāḍī-zādelis, the Ṣūfīs did not however go as far as the Qāḍī-zādelis in their expressions of hostility. They usually referred to their opponents as muta'aṣṣibīn (fanatics), but sometimes they also addressed them as zindīq, mülḥıd and even kāfir, because of their denial of the miraculous power of the Ṣūfīs.

In fact, the defensive policy of the Ṣūfīs towards the Qāḍī-zādelis, contrary to what the Qāḍī-zādelis had expected, won the sympathy of the people as well as that

of government officials. In some cases, the Shaykh al-Islām, who was against Ṣūfī practices, even protected the Ṣūfīs against the attacks and abuses of the Qāḍī-zādelis.[23] The popularity of the Ṣūfīs was further enhanced by their tolerant and flexible attitude towards coffee and tobacco.

The Qāḍī-zādelis might have been more successful in their struggle against the Ṣūfīs if they had adopted a more comprehensive and well-defined policy against them. Above all, they should have used persuasion rather than violence to achieve their goals. By their extreme stance, the Qāḍī-zādelis alienated the majority of the people who felt much more sympathy for the oppressed than the oppressor.

23. Cf. pp. 240-2, above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

1) Manuscripts

ʿAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī, Taʾdīb al-mutamarrīdīn, Istanbul University Library, MS. Tyz. 1738.

Dawarānı Ṣūfiyye risālesi, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hacı Resid, 97/5.

Naẓmī Meḥmed, Hadiyyat al-Ikhwān, Istanbul University Library, MS. Tyz. 1604.

Qāḍī-zāde Meḥmed b. Toghānī Muṣṭafā, Irshād al-ʿUqūl al-mustaqīma ilāʾl-uṣūl al-qawīma bi-ibṭāl al-bidʿa al-saqīma, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Fatih, 5407/2.

Qāmiʿat al-bidʿa nāṣirat al-sunna dāmighat al-mubtadaʿa, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Birinci serez, 3876.

Tāj al-rasāʾil wa minhāj al-wasāʾil, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 1926.

Kitāb-ı maqbūl der ḥāl-i khuyūl, British Museum, MS. Add. 7901.

Risāla-i Qāḍī-zāde, İstanbul University Library, MS. Tyz. 1534.

Kitāb-i Qāḍī-zāde, (in the possession of the author of this thesis).

Risāla fīʾl-ṣalāt al-nāfila, Nuriosmaniye Library, 4441/7.

Risāla fīʾl-nawāqıs al-wuḍūʿ, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Esʿad Efendi, 951/14.

Risāla fī bayān al-īmān al-tafṣīlī, Nuriosmaniye Library, MS. 1742/3/2155.

Risāla Qāḍī-zāde, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Atif Efendi, 1728/1.

Risāla-ı Qāḍī-zāde, Edinburgh University Library, Turkish MSS. 20.

Risāla fi'l-īmān wa'l-ṣalāt, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hale Efendi, 827/24.

Risāla-ı Qāḍī-zāde, (in the possession of the author of this thesis).

Risāla-ı Qāḍī-zāde, (in the possession of the author of this thesis).

Risāla-i Qāḍī-zāde, İstanbul University Library, T. 1534.

Shaykhī Siwāsī ʻAbd al-Majīd b. Muḥarram, Durar al-ʻaqā'id wa ghurar kull sā'iq wa qā'ıd, Millet Library, MS. ʻAlī Emīrī, Şer'iyye, 281.

Tafsīr-ı sūre-i Fātiḥa, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mıhrişah Sultan, 300/2.

Diwānı Shaykhī, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Lala İsmail Efendi, 453/1.

Lughatı Mathnawī Sharīf, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mustafa Aşir Efendi, 385.

Miyār al-ṭarīq, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mihrişah Sultan, 300/3.

Sharḥ-i ghazal-i mimiyye li-mawlanā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mihrişah Sultan, 300/4.

Haḍarāt khamsa, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mıhrişah Sultan 300/5.

Kitāb bidāʻat al-wāʻiẓīn, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Kılıç Ali Paşa, 1032.

Durar al-ʻaqā'id, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Mihrişah Sultan, 300/1.

Tarjuma-ı risāla-i shaykh al-akbar, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Fatiḥ, 5385/7.

Üstüwānī Meḥmed b. Aḥmad, *Risālat al-mas'ala*, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Yazma Bağışlar, 363/1.

Risāla-i Üstüwānī, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Denizli, 149.

Kitāb al-Fiqh, Nuriosmaniye Library, MS. 1376.

Kitāb-i Üstüwānī, (in the possession of the author of this thesis).

Kitāb-i Üstüwānī, (in the possession of the author of this thesis).

Kitāb-i Üstüwānī, (in the possession of the author of this thesis).

'Aqā'id ve 'ibadete āid risāla, Süleymaniye Library, Yazmabagişlar, 574.

Kitāb-i Üstüwānī, İstanbul University Library, MS. T. 4822.

Wānī Meḥmed b. Muṣṭafā, *Muḥyi'l-sunna wa mumīt al-bid'a* İstanbul University Library, MS. Tyz. 6273.

Risāla fi'l tahzīr 'an al-bid'a wa'l-ahwā', Süleymaniye Library, MS. Resid Efendi, 985/63.

Taṣawwufī bid'atlardan sakinmaya dair risāla, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hacıbeşir ağa, 406/3.

Risāla fī radd aḥwāl al-mub'tadi, Süleymaniye Library, MS. M. Halid Efendi, 453/3.

Risāla fī karahāt al-jahr bi'l-dhikr, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Lala Ismail 685/1.

'Arā'is al-Qur'ān wa nafā'is al-Furqān, Süleymaniye Library, Es'ad Ef. 2319.

Münshe'atī Wānī, Millet Library, MS. Feyzullah Efendi, 2114.

2) Printed Works

'Abd al-Aḥad Nūrī, Maw'ızā-ı hasene (İstanbul, 1309 A.H.).

Fī haqq al-dawarān al-Ṣufiyya, (İstanbul, n.d.)

'Aṭā'i Nev'i-zāde 'Aṭā'ullah, Hadā'iq al-haqā'iq fī takmilat al-shaqā'iq, (İstanbul, 1268 A.H.)

'Aynī 'Alī, Qawānīn-i 'Othmān der khulaṣa-i mezāmīn-ı defter-i dīwān, (İstanbul, 1280).

Ḥajji Khalīfa, Muṣṭafā b. 'Abd Allah, Fadlaka-i tārīkh, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1286-7 A.H.)

Mīzān al-ḥaqq fī ikhtiyār al-aḥaqq (İstanbul, 1280 A.H.)

Mīzānü'l-haqq fī ihtiyari'l-ahakk, O.Ş. Gökyay (ed.) (İstanbul, 1972).

The Balance of Truth, trans. by G.L. Lewis, (London, 1957).

Kashf al-Ẓunūn 'an Asmā' al-Kutub wa'l-Funūn, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1941-43).

Jihān-numā (İstanbul, 1732).

Düstür al-'Amal lī-ıṣlāḥ al-halel (İstanbul, 1280 A.H.)

Katib Čelebi – see Hajji Khalīfa.

Kitāb-i Müstetāb (Ankara, 1974) Yücel, Yaşar (ed.).

Kitābu Mesālihi'l Müslimīn ve Menāfi'i'l-Mü'minīn (Ankar, 1980), Yücel, Yaşar (ed.).

Meḥmed Khalīfa, Tārikh-i Ghilmānī (İstanbul, 1340 A.H.)

Murādī, Meḥmed Khalīl, Silk al-Durar fī A'yān al-qarn al-thānī 'ashar, 4 vols. (1291, 1301).

Muṣṭafā Nūrī Pasha, Sayyid, Netāyij al-Wuqū'āt, 4 vols. (İstanbul, 1327 A.H.)

Na'īma, Muṣṭafā, Tārikh-ī Na'īmā, 6 vols. (İstanbul, 1280 A.H.)

Pečewī, İbrāhīm, Tārikh-ī Pečewī, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1283 A.H.)

Qāḍī-zāde Mehmed, "Qasīda", in 'Othmānlı Tārīkh we Edebiyyāt mejmu'ası, II (İstanbul, 1335),14, pp. 278-82.

Qara Ćelebi-zāde, 'Abd al-'Azīz, Rawḍat al-Abrār (Būlaq, 1248 A.H.)

Qoči Beg, Koçi Bey Risālesi, (İstanbul, 1972).

Rāshid, Mehmed, Tārīkh-i Rāshıd, 5 vols. (İstanbul, 1327).

Silaḥdār Meḥmed Aghā, Silaḥdār Tārīkhī, 2 vols. (İstanbul 1928).

Ṣolaq-zāde, Meḥmed Hemdem Čelebī, Tārīkh-i Ṣolaq-zāde, (İstanbul, 1297).

Shaykhī, 'Abd al-Majīd Siwāsī, Kaza ve Kader Risalesi, trans. by Z. Hayran (Sivas, n.d.)

'Ushāqī-zāde, İbrāhīm, Dhayl Shaqā'ıq, H.J. Kissling (ed.) (Wiesbaden, 1965).

Waysi b. Muḥammad, "Qaṣīda" in HOP, III, pp. 814-18.

Wā'iẓanī Ayasofya, İstanbul University Library, MS. K. Tyz. 1878.

Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi

The fermāns of Sulṭān Murād IV, Topkapı Palace, E. 7814, 7804, 5221/15, 344, 7945, 5222, 11567.

A letter concerning the prohibition of tobacco, E. 7012.

The fermān of Meḥmed IV prohibiting the drinking of alcohol, D. 7012.

Vaizlerin Yevmiyeleri Defteri (in the mosques of the Sulṭāns), no. D. 5123.

İstanbul Kadılarının isimleri, ilām ve arzları,
nos. E. 11889, 11800, 11683, 9941, 3970, 3798, 3944, 10933, 9951, 1059, 10830.
nos. D. 5340, A. XVI, XIX.

SECONDARY SOURCES

1) Manuscripts

'Abd al-Laṭīf b. Muhammad Es'ad (the work has no title, see introduction, p. 9).

Anonymous, al-Risāla tuḥfat ahl al-sunna, MS. dated 1163 A.H. (in the possession of the author of this thesis).

'Abdī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān, Waqā'ıname, Tārīkhī Sulṭān Meḥmed Rabi' (H. 1103/1691-2), Süleymaniye Library, MS. Beşir Ef. 250

'Alī Jamālī (Zenbilli), Risāla al-dawarān, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Harput, 11.

Devrān-ı Şufiyyenin cevāzina dāir risāla, Süleymaniye Library, MS. M. Arif 212/2

Risāla fi'l-dhikr al-jahrī wa'l dawarān, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Esad Ef. 1761/6.

Al-Anṣārī, 'Umdat al-Safwa fī ḥall al-qahwa in Silvestre de Sacy, Chestomathie Arabe, (Paris, 1826), pp. 138-169.

Bahjatī, Hüseyn Ef., Tārīkhī Sülāla-i Köprülü-zāde, Köprülü Library, MS. 212.

Birgiwī, Meḥmed Pīr 'Alī, Risāla fī ınkār al-taghannī wa'l-lahn, Millet Library, MS. 'Arabi, 3448/5.

Risāla fi'l-muṣafaḥa, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Halet Ef. 815/10; Şehid Ali Paşa 2728/3

Risāla fi'l-dhikr, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hasan Hüsnü Paşa, 771/3.

Bostan-zāde, Meḥmed, Fetwā on Coffee, British Museum, MS. Add. 7828

Edirnewī, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, Nuhbat al-Tawarīkh wa'l-Akhbār, Türk Tarih Kurumu Library, MS. no. 518.

al-Ḥalabī, İbrāhīm b. Mūḥammad, al-rahṣ wa'l-waqṣ li-mustaḥill al-raqṣ, British Museum, OR. 12795, III, fols. 53a-9b.

al-Ḥalabī, İbrāhīm b. Muḥammad, *Risāla fī Sharafī Nabiyyinā*, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Yazmabagişlar, 2061/2.

Ni'mat al-Dharī'a fī Nuṣrat al-Sharī'a, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Fatih, 2280.

al-Rahs wa'l-waqṣ li-mustaḥill al-raqṣ, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Esad Ef. 222-32.

Hasan Bey-zāde, *Tawarīkhī Ālı 'Othmān*, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Hafid Ef. 225.

Hüdāyī, 'Aziz Maḥmud, *Kashf al-ghinā an wajh al-samā'*, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Pertev Paşa, 238/2

Ibn Kemāl, Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Süleymān, *Risāla fī taḥqiq al-ḥaqq wa ibṭāl ra'y al-Ṣūfiyya fi'l raqṣ wa'l-dawarān*, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Meḥmed Hafid Ef. 453/8.

Risāla fī taḥqiq al-raqṣ, Süleymaniye Library MS. Denizli 114/2

Risāla fī hurmat al-raqṣ wa'l dawarān, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Reisulkuttap 1181/17

Risāla fī radd īmānı fir'awn, Süleymaniye Library MS. Reşid Ef. 985/62.

Fatāwā fī ḥaqq Qızılbāş, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Esad Ef. 3548/3.

Fatāwā fī ḥaqq ibn 'Arabī, Süleymaniye Library, Esad Ef. 1694/3

al-Miṣrī, Niyāzī, *Risāla fī dawarān al-Ṣūfiyya*, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Pertev Paşa 620/9.

Niksāri İbrāhīm b. Muḥammad, *Burḥān al-laḥn fī ḥukm al-taghannī wa'l-dawarān*, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Yazmabagışlar 701.

Sünbül Sinan, *Risāla fi'l-Taḥqiqiyya*, Süleymaniye Library, MS. Esad Ef. 1691/1.

Shukrī, Meḥmed b. Ismā'īl, *İstanbuldaki Tekiyelerinī tārīkhleri wa bānilerī*, Belediye Library, MS. K.75.

2) Printed Works and typewritten theses.

'Abd Allāh Bosnawī, Tajalliyāt 'Arā'is al-nuṣūṣ fī mansamat ḥikam al-Fuṣūṣ, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1290).

'Abd al-Bāqī Muḥammad Fu'ad, Miftāḥ Kunūz al-Sunna, (Lohor, 1971).

al-Mu'jam al-Mufahris li-Alfāẓ al-Qur'ān al-Karīm, (Cairo, 1945).

Abde l-Kadir Ali H., The Life, Personality and Writings of al-Junayd, (London, 1962).

'Abd al-Wahhāb ibn Muḥammad, Kitāb al-Tawḥīd, trans. İ.R. al-Fārūqī, (Beirut, 1979)

Ibn Abí 'l-Dunyā, Abu Bakr 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad, Dhamm al-Malāhī, (ed. trans. by J. Robson) (London, 1938).

Adıvar, Adnan, Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim (Istanbul, 1953)

Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ash'ath, Sunan Abī Dāwūd, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1369-70).

Afifi, A.E., The Mystical Philosophy of Muḥy al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī (Cambridge, 1939).

Akdağ, Mustafa, "Genel çizgileriyle XVII: Yüzyıl Türkiye Tarihi" in Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi IV (1966), pp. 201-247.

Türkiy'enin İktisadi ve İçtimai Tarihi Istanbul, 1974), I. II.

"Türkiye Tarihinde içtimâî buhranlar serisinden: Medreseli isyanları" in İİFM, XI (1949-50), pp. 361-87).

"Osmanlı imparatorluğunun kuruluş ve inkişafı devrinde Türkiye'nin iktisadî" Belleten, 13 (1949), pp. 497-571.

"Osmanlı Müesseseleri Hakkinda Notlar" in Ankara Üniversitesi Dil Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi, XIII (1955), pp. 27-51.

Aktepe, Münir, "Mustafa I, in IA, VIII, pp. 692-5.

"Mustafa Paşa" in IA, VIII, pp. 736-8.

Akyürek, Güner, XVII Asırda Osmanlı Şeyhülıslamları, İstanbul University, unpublished graduation thesis, 1963.

Algar, Hamid, "The Naqshbandi order: a preliminary survey of its history and significance" in SI, 44 (1796), pp. 123.

"Bibliographical notes on the Naqshbandi tariqat", in G.F. Hourani, ed. Essays on Islamic Philosophy and Science (Albany, New York, 1975), pp. 254-9.

'Alī, Bolūwī, Adāb al-Ṭuruq, (İstanbul, n.d.)

'Alī, Emīrī, "Meshīkhāt-ı Islamiyye Tarīkhčesi" in 'İlmiyye Salnāmesi (İstanbul, 1334).

'Alī, Muṣṭafā, Kunh al-Akhbār, 5 vols., (İstanbul, 1277).

Mawā'id al-nafā'is fī qawā'id al-majālis, ed. O.Ş. Gökyay, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1978).

Alī, A.Yusuf, The Holy Qur'ān, text, translation and commentary, (Leicester, 1975).

al-Albānī, Nāṣır al-Dīn, Silsila al-Aḥadīth al-Ḍa'īfā wa'l-Mawḍū'ā, 2 vols., (Beirut, 1399).

Silsila al-Aḥadīth al-Ṣaḥīḥa, 2 vols. (Damascus, 1378).

Alderson, A.D., Structure of the Ottoman Dynasty, (Oxford, 1956).

Altınay, A.R., 16 Asırda İstanbul hayatı, (İstanbul, 1935).

Altundağ, Ş., "Osman II", in İA, IX, pp. 443-48.

"Osmanlılarda Kadıların Selahiyet ve Vazifeleri hakkında", Türk Tarih Kurumu, VI Tarih Kongresi, (Ankara 1967), pp. 342-54.

Altınsu, Abdukadir, Osmanlı Şeyhülislamarı, (Ankara, 1972).

Ibn al-Amīn Mahmud Kemāl, Diwān-ı Yaḥyā, (İstanbul, 1334).

Anderson, S.
"Dervish Orders of Contaninople" in M.W., 12 (1922), pp. 53-61.

"The whirling and howling Dervishes" in M.W. 13 (1923), pp. 181-92.

Anhegger, R. "Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi nin Osmanlı Devlet teşkilatina Dair Mülahazaları in Türkiyat Mecmuası, X, (1951-3), pp. 365-393.

Anqarawī, İsmā'il Rusūkhī, Minhāj al-Fuqarā' (istanbul, 1256).

Kitāb Ḥujjat al-Samā', (İstanbul, 1256).

Sılsile-i Tariqi Jalwatiyya, (İstanbul, 1291).

Ibn al-'Arabī, Muḥyi 'l-Dīn, Sufis of Andalusia; the Rūh al-quds and Al-durrat al-fākhirah of Ibn 'Arabī. Tr. with intod. and notes by R.W.J. Austin, (London, 1971).

Risalat al-Wujudiyya , trans. by T.H. Weir, (London, 1976).

Arberry, A.J., ed. Aspects of Islamic Civilization, as depicted in the original texts, (London, 1964).

The Doctrine of the Sūfīs (Cambridge, 1935).

An Introduction to the History of Sufism, (Oxford, 1942).

"Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī" in Islamic Studies, I , (1962), pp. 89-107.

ed. Religion in the Middle East, (London, 1957).

Pages from the Kitab al-Luma', (London, 1947).

Muslim Saints and Mystics (London, 1979).

Arberry, A.J., Revelation and Reason in Islam, (London, 1957).

Sufism, (London, 1950).

Arendonk, C. Van, "Ḳahwa", EI², IV, pp. 449-53.

Arnold, T.W., The Caliphate, (Oxford, 1924).

Atay, H., "Memleketimizde İlim ve Din Anlayışı Üzerine" İFD, XVIII (1969).

Ateş, Ahmed, "Ibn al-ʻArabī" in EI², III, pp. 701-711.

"Muhyid-Dīn ʻArabī" in İA, VIII, pp. 533-55.

Atsız, Nihal, Birgili Mehmet Efendi Bibliyografyası, (İstanbul, 1966).

Austin, M.W., "Some observations on the study of Sufi origins" in Actas, Do IV Cogresso de estudos Arabes E Islāmicos Coimbra - Lisboa, 1968, (Leiden, 1971), pp. 101-7.

Aynī, M.A., Türk Ahlākçıları (İstanbul, 1939).

Averroes, Ibn Rushd, On the Harmony of Religion and Philosophy, trans. by G.F. Hourani.

al-Aywansarāyī, Ḥāfiẓ Husayn b. al-Hāj Isma'il, Ḥadīqat al-Jawāmiʻ, 2 vols. İstanbul, 1281.

Babinger, F., "Köprülüler" in EI¹, 1059-62.

Mehmed the Conqueror and his time (trans. from German by R. Manheim), Princeton, 1978.

Baer, G., "The administrative, economic and social functions of Turkish Guilds", IJMES, I (1970), pp. 28-50.

"Fellah and Townsman in Ottoman Egypt" Asian and African Studies (Jerusalem) VIII (1972), pp. 221-56.

al-Baghdādī, Ismā'īl Pasha b. Muḥammad Amīn, Haddiyyat al-'Arifīn fī Asmā'l-Muallifīn wa Āthār al-Muṣannifīn, 2 vols., İstanbul, 1951.

Īḍāḥ al-Maknūn fi 'l-Shayl 'alā Kashf al-Ẓunūn, 2 vols.,(İstanbul, 1947).

Bahman Muhammad I.M., "Sufi Mysticism in Islam" Muslim World, 21 (1931), pp. 29-33.

Balcioğlu, Tāhir Harimi, Türk Tarihinde Mezhep Cereyanları, ed. H.Z. Ülken (İstanbul, n.d.)

Baltacı, C., XV ve XVI asırlarda Osmanlı Medreseleri (İstanbul, 1976).

Bandirma-zāde, Mecmū'a-i Tekāyā (İstanbul, 1302).

Barkan, Ö.L., "Kanunname", in İA , VI, pp. 185-195.

"Bir imār ve iskān metodu olarak temlikler, I, İstilā devrinin kolonizatör Türk dervişleri ve zaviyeler" in Vakıflar Dergisi, II (Ankara, 1942), pp. 279-386.

"Osmanlı imparatorluğu teşkilāt ve muesseselerinīn Şer'ılıġī meselesi" in İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası, XI (1945), pp. 214-75.

"Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir iskān ve kolonizasyon metodu olarak sürgünler" in İİFM, XI (1950), pp. 524-69.

"Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir iskān ve kolonizasyon metodu olarak sürgünler" in İİFM, XV (1954), pp. 209-37.

"Timar" in İA, XII, pp. 287-333.

Barker, T.M., Double Eagle and Crescent,(New York, 1967).

Barthold, W., İslām Medeniyeti Tarihi, trans. by F. Köprülü, (Ankara, 1966).

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd Allāh, Ibn Baṭṭuṭa Travels in Asia and Africa 1325-1354, trans. selected by H.A.R. Gibb, (London, 1939).

Bausani, A., "Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī" in <u>EI</u>^{2}, II, pp. 393-7.

"Hurufiyya" in <u>EI</u>^{2}, III, pp. 600-1.

Baykara, R., "Osmanlı Devletinde İlk Tütün Yasağı ve Iktisadi Sebebi" in <u>Tarih Dünyası</u>, 23 (İstanbul, 1951).

Bayrakdar, M. <u>La Philosophie Mystique de la Réligion chez Dāwud de Kayseri</u>, unpublished Ph.D. thesis,(Sorbonne, 1978).

Bayram, Mücessem, <u>Bahā'i Mehmed Efendi</u>, Istanbul University graduation dissertation (History) 1960.

Baysun, Cavit, "Ahmed I" in <u>İA</u>, pp. 161-64.

"Meḥmed IV" in <u>İA</u>, VII, pp. 547-557.

"Cemāli Ali Efendi" in <u>İA</u>, III, pp. 85-88.

"Ebussuud Efendi" in <u>İA</u>, IV, pp. 92-99.

"Emīr Sultan'ın Hayatı ve Şahsiyeti" in <u>İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi</u>, I (1949), pp. 77-94.

"Kösem Wālide" in <u>EI</u>^{2}, V, p. 272.

"Murad IV" in <u>İA</u>, VII, pp. 625-47.

Bell, J.N., <u>Love Theory in Later Ḥanbalite Islam</u>, (Albany, 1979).

Berkes, Niyazı, <u>The Development of Secularism in Turkey</u>, (Montreal, 1964).

"Iṣlāh" (Turkey), in <u>EI</u>^{2}, IV, pp. 167-70.

Bernand, M., "Idjmāʻ" in <u>EI</u>^{2}, III, pp. 1023-26.

Bilge, M., <u>İlk Devir Osmanlı Medreseleri</u>, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, (Istanbul, 1974).

Bilmen, Ömer Nasuhi, <u>Ashab-ı Kiram Hakkında Müslumanların Nezīh İ'tikadları</u>, (Istanbul, n.d.)

<u>Hukuk-ı Islāmiye ve ıstilahāt-ı Fikhiye Kāmusu</u>, 6 vols. (İstanbul, 1949).

Birge, J.K. The Bektashi Order of Dervishes, (London, 1937).

Birgiwi, Meḥmed b. Pir ʻAlī, al-Ṭarīqat al-Muḥammadiyya, (İstanbul, 1287).

Bosworth, C.E., The Islamic Dynasties, (Edinburgh, 1980).

Bowen, H., "Agha" in EI^{2}, I, pp. 245-6.

Böwering, G. The Mystical Vision of Existence in Classical Islam. The Qur'ānic Hermeneutics of the Ṣūfī sahl at-Tustarī, (d. 283/896). (Berlin, 1980).

Braudel, F., The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II, 2 vols. (London, 1972).

Brockelmann, C., Geschichte der Arabischen Lit eratur, 5 vols. (Leiden, 1937-1949).

History of the Islamic Peoples. Trans. by J. Carmichael and M. Perlmann, (London, 1952).

Brown, J.P., The Dervishes: or Oriental Spiritualism, (London, 1968).

al-Bukhāri, Muḥammad b. Ismāʻil, al-Jāmiʻ al-Ṣaḥīḥ (with English translation) 9 vols., (Chicago, 1979).

Burke, E., "The Moroccan Ulama, 1860-1912" in N.R. Keddie (ed.) Scholars, Saints and Sufis, (Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 93-125

Busbec, de Ogier Ghiselin, The Turkish Letters, trans. by B.E. Seymour Forster (Oxford, 1968).

Cahen, C., "Bābā'ī", in EI^{2}, I, pp. 843-4.

"Futuwwa" in EI^{2}, II, pp. 961-5.

Pre-Ottoman Turkey (trans. J. Williams) (London, 1968).

Canaan Tavfik, Muhammedan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine, (London, 1927).

Cantemir, D. The history of the growth and decay of the Ottoman Empire (trans. by N. Tindal) (London, 1756).

Cezar M. Sertoğlu, M. and others, Resimli Haritalı Mufassal Osmanlı Tarihi, 6 vols., (İstanbul, 1957-63.

Chambers, R.L., "The Ottoman Ulema and the Tanzimat" in N.R. Keddie (ed.) Scholars, Saints and Sūfīs,(Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 33-46.

Chatelier, D., Les Conféries Musulmanes du Hedjaz, (Paris, 1887).

Coles, P., The Ottoman Impact on Europe, (London, 1968).

Cook, M.A., Population Pressure in Rural Anatolia, (London, 1972).

Corbin, H. Creative Imagination in the Ṣūfism of Ibn ʻArabī trans. by R. Manheim, (Princeton, 1969).

Creasy, E.S., History of the Ottoman Turks, (London, 1854), I, II.

Crone, P. and Cook, M., Hagarism; the making of the Islamic World, (Cambridge, 1980).

Cvetkova, B.A., Les Institutions Ottomanes en Europe, (Wiesbaden, 1978).

Çağatay, N., Bir Türk Kurumu olan Ahilik (Ankara, 1974).

Danışman, Z., Koçi Bey Risalesi, (İstanbul, 1972).

Danişmend, İ.H., İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi, 5 vols., (İstanbul, 1971-72).

Türklük Meseleleri, (İstanbul, 1966).

De Groot, A.H., The Ottoman Empire and Dutch Republic, (İstanbul, 1978).

De Jong, F., "Khalwatiyya" in EI[2] IV, pp. 991-3.

Turuq and turuq-linked institutions in nineteenth century Egypt, (Leiden, 1978).

Deny, J., "Wālide Sulṭān" in EI[1], IV, pp. 1113-18.

Develioğlu, Ferit, Osmanlıca-Türkçe, ansiklopedik lügat (Ankara, 1978).

Düzdağ, Ertuğrul, Şeyhulislām Ebussuud Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. asır Türk Hayatı (İstanbul, 1972).

al-Dawwanī, Jalāl al-Dīn, Imān-ı Fir'awn, (Egypt, 1964).

D'Ohsson, I. Mouradgea, Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman, 7 vols., Paris (1787-90).

Donalson, D.M., Studies in Muslim Ethics, (London, 1953).

Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant,
1) The diary of Master Thomas Dallam,
2) Extracts from the diaries of Dr. John Covel,
ed. J. Theodore Bent, (London, 1843).

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, 4 vols. and supplement, (Leiden, 1913-38).

The Encyclopaedia of Islam (new edition), (Leiden, 1954 -)

Eraydın, Selçuk, Tasavvuf ve Tarīkatler, (İstanbul, 1981).

Ergin, O. Türkiye Maarif Tarihi, 5 vols., (İstanbul, 1939-45).

Ewliyā Čelebi, Meḥmed Zillī b. Derwish, Seyāḥatnāme, 10 vols., (İstanbul, 1896-1938).

Fakhry, Majid, A History of Islamic Philosophy, (New York, London, 1970).

Farah, C.E., "Rules governing the Šayḫ-muršid's conduct" in Numen, XXI (1974), I, pp. 81-97.

Farmer, H. G. A History of Arabian Music to the XIIIth Century, (London, 1929).

Music the Priceless Jewel
From the Kitāb al 'ıqd al Farid of Ibn Abd Rabbıhı (d. 940) (Scotland 1942).

Farmer, H. George, "The Music of Islam" in Ancient and Oriental Music, ed. Wellesz Egon (London, 1957), pp. 421-77.

al-Fārūqi, İ.R. "The essence of religious experience in Islam" in Numen, XX (1973), pp. 186-201.

"Towards a new methodology for Qur'ānic exegesis" in Islamic Studies, I (1962), I, pp. 35-52.

"Science and traditional values in Islamic society" in Zygon, Journal of Religion and Science, II (1967), pp. 231-46.

'Uruba and Religion (Amsterdam, 1963).

Faroqhi, Suraiya, "The Tekke of Hacı Bektaş : social position and economic activities" in IJMES, VII (1976), pp. 183-208.

"XVI-XVIII y.y. da Orta Anadoluda Şeyh aıleleri" in Türkiye Iktisat Tarihi Semineri Metinler, Tartişmalar, (Ankara, 1975) sh. 197-229.

"Social Mobility Among the Ottoman 'Ulema in the late Sixteenth Century" in IJMES, 4 (1873), pp. 204-218

Fennī, Ismā'īl, Wahdat Wujūd wa Muḥyi'l-Din 'Arabī, (İstanbul, 1928).

Field, C.H.A., Mystics and Saints of Islam, London, 1910.

Fiğlalı, E.R. (ed.) Āsāfnāme, (Ankara, 1977).

Findley, C., Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire, (Princeton, 1980).

Flemming, B., "Die Worwahhabitsche Fitna im Osmanischen Kairo 1711" Uzunçarşılıya Armağan, (Ankara, 1976), pp. 56-65.

Fraser, C., Annals of the Turkish Empire, (London, 1832), I.

Friedlander, I., The Whirling Dervishes (London, 1975).

Gardet, L. "Dhikr" in EI², II, pp. 223-7.

Garnett, L.M.J. Mysticism and Magic in Turkey (London, 1912).

Gerber, Haim, "Guilds in Seventeenth-century Anatolian Bursa" in Asian and African Studies, XI (1976), pp. 51-86.

al-Ghazālī, Aḥmad al-Ṭūsī, Bawāriq al-Ilmā ed. trans. J. Robson, (London, 1938).

al-Ghazāli, Muhammad, Iḥya' ʻUlūm al-Dīn, 4 vols. (Egypt, 1348).

Gibb, E.J.W., A History of Ottoman Poetry, 6 vols., (London, 1900-1909).

Gibb, H.A.R. Islam (Mohammedanism) (Oxford, 1978).

"Lutfi Pasa on the Ottoman Empire" in Oriens, 15 (1962), pp. 287-95.

Modern Trends in Islam, (Chicago, 1947).

Studies on the Civilization of Islam, ed. by S.J. Shaw and W.R. Polk, (London, 1962).

Gibb, H.A.R. - Bowen, H. Islamic Society and the West. A study of the impact of Western civilization on Moslem culture in the Near East, vol. I, parts, 1-11, Oxford, 1950, 1957.

Gibb, H.R.B., "The Heritage of Islam in the Modern World" in IJMES.
I in vol. 1 no. 1, 1970, January.
II in vol. 1 no. 3, 1970, July.
III in vol. II no. 2, 1971, April.

Gilsenan, M. Saint and Sufi in Modern Egypt, (Oxford, 1973).

Glock, I. Niyāzī al-Miṣrī, Ein Beitrag zur Islamischen Mystik Kleinasiens im 17 Jahrhundert, unpublished Ph.D., (Bonn, 1951).

Gordlevskij, V., "Le tariqat de Mysri Niyazi" in Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URRS, 1929, pp. 153-60.

Goldziher, I., Muslim Studies, trans. by Stern-Barker, London, 2 vols. 1967-71.

The Ẓāhirīs, their doctrine and their history, (trans. ed. W. Behn), (Leiden, 1971).

Gökbilgin, M.T., "Eğri Seferi" in İA, IV, pp. 196-8.

"XVII Asırda, Osmanlı devletinde ıslahat ihtiyaṣ ve temayülleri ve Kâtip Çelebi" in Kātib Çelebi, hayatı ve eserleri, (Ankara, 1957), pp. 197-218.

"Ḥekīm-Bashi" in EI², III, pp. 339-40.

"Ibrahim" in İA, V, pp. 880-85.

"Ibrāhīm", in EI², III, p. 983.

"Köprülüler" İD, VI, pp. 892-908.

"Köprülüler, Fazıl Ahmet Paṣa" in İA, VI, p. 898.

"Lütfi Paṣa" in İA, VII, pp. 96-101.

Osmanlı müesseseleri teṣkilātı ve Medeniyeti tarihine genel bakeṣ, (İstanbul, 1977).

"Ulemā" in İA, XIV, pp. 23-6.

Gökbilgin, M.T., Repp, R.C. "Köprülü" in EI², V, pp. 256-63.

Göktürk, H., "Enderūn" in İstanbul Ansiklopedisi IX pp. 5115-20.

"Ekmel Tekkesi" in İstanbul Ansiklopedisi, IX, pp. 498-9.

Gölpınarlı, Abdübākī, "Celvetiye" in İA, II, 67-69.

Mevlānā Celāleddin, (İstanbul, 1959).

Mevlevî Âdāb ve Erkānı (İstanbul, 1963).

Gölpınarlı, Abdübāki, "Mevlevilik" in İA, VIII, pp. 164-71.

"Niyazi" in İA, IX, pp. 305-7.

"Niyāzî-i Misrî" in Şarkiyat Mecmuası, VII 1972), pp. 183-226.

Melamilik ve Melamiler (İstanbul 1931).

Mevlānā, Hayatı ve Felsefesi (İstanbul 1959).

Mevlānā'dan Sonra Mevlevilik (İstanbul, 1953).

Simavna Kadısıoglu Şeyh Bedreddin (İstanbul, 1966).

"Şemsiye" in İA, pp. 422-3.

Gran , Peter, Islamic Roots of Capitalism, (Austin, 1981).

Green, S.A., The Tunisian Ulama (Leiden, 1978).

Griswold, W.J., Political Unrest and Rebellion in Anatolia, 1605-1609, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Los Angeles, 1966.

Grunebaum, G.E. Von, Islam and Medieval Hellenism, (London, 1976).

Medieval Islam. A Study in Cultural Orientation, (Chicago-London, 1969)

Muhammadan Festivals, (New York, 1951).

ed. Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization, (Chicago, 1955).

Grenville, F., The Muslim and Christian Calendars, (London, 1977).

Gümüşhanevi, Ahmed Ziyāuddīn, Jāmi' al-Usūl Velīler ve Tarikatlarda usūl trans. by R. Serin, (İstanbul, 1977).

Gür, Refik, Osmanlılarda Kadılık, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, İstanbul, edebiyat Fakültesi.

Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad, Musnad, 6 vols., (Beirut, n.d.)

Hasluck, F.W., Christianity and Islam under the Sultans (Oxford 1929), I, II.

Hayran, Z., Kaza ve Kader Risālesi (Sivas, n.d.).

Heper, M. Metin, Bureaucracy in the Ottoman-Turkish State; An analysis of the emergence and development of a bureaucratic ruling tradition. Syracuse University, unpublished Ph.D. 1971.

Hershlag, Z.Y., Introduction to the modern economic history of the Middle East, (Leiden, 1980).

Heyd, U. "The Jewish Communities of Istanbul in the XVIIth Century" Oriens, 6 (1953).

"Kānūn and Sharīa in Old Ottoman Criminal Justice" in Proceedings of the Israel academy of sciences and humanities, III (Jerusalem, 1969) pp. 1-18.

"The Ottoman ʻulemā and westernization in the time of Selim III and Mahmud II" in U. Heyd (ed.) Studies in Islamic History and Civilization (Jerusalem, 1961), pp. 63-96.

"Some Aspects of the Ottoman Fetvā" in BSOAS, 38 (1969), pp. 35-56.

Studies in Old Ottoman Criminal Law, ed. V.L. Ménage, (Oxford, 1973).

"ʻIlmiyye" in EI^2, III, pp. 1152-4.

Hitti, P.K., History of the Arabs, (London, 1958).

Hodgson, M.G.S., The Venture of Islam, 3 vols. (Chicago, 1974).

Hopwood, D., "A pattern of revival movements in Islam?" in IQ, 15 (1971), pp. 149-58.

Hourani, A. Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age 1798-1919, (Oxford, 1962).

" The Emergence of the Modern Middle East, (London, 1981).

Europe and the Middle East, (London, 1980).

al-Hujwīrī, ʻAlī b. ʻUthmān, *Kashf al-Maḥjūb*, trans. by R.A. Nicholson, (London, 1911).

Ibnul Emīn Maḥmud Kemāl, *Diwān-ı Yaḥyā*, (İstanbul, 1334).

İbrāhīm, Efendi, *ʻIlmiyye Salnāmesi*, (İstanbul, 1334).

Imber, C., "Qočı Beg" in *EI*², V, pp. 248-9.

İnalcık, Halil, *Fatih devri üzerinde tetkikler ve vesikalar*, (Ankara, 1954).

"Ghulām" in *EI*², II, pp. 1085-1091.

"The heyday and decline of the Ottoman Empire", *Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. I, pp. 324-353.

"Ḳanūn", EI², IV, pp. 558-62.

"Ḳanūnnāme", EI², IV, pp. 562-66.

"The nature of traditional society" in ed. R. Ward and P. Rustow, *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey*, (Princeton 1964), pp. 42-63.

The Ottoman Empire; Conquest, Organisation and Economy, (London, 1978).

The Ottoman Empire : The Classical Age 1300-1600, (London, 1973).

"Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun kuruluş ve ınkişāfı devrinde Türkiye'nin ikisadī vaziyeti üzerinde bir tetkik münasebetiyle" *Belleten*, 15 (1951), pp. 629-690.

"Örf" in *İA*, IX, p. 480.

"The Rise of the Ottoman Empire" in M. Cook (ed.) *A History of the Ottoman Empire*, (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 1-53.

İpşirli, Mehmed, "Mustafa Selāniki and his history" in *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, IX (İstanbul, 1978), pp. 417-72

Iqbāl, Muḥammad, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islām*, (Lahore, 1961).

Itzkowits, N., "Eighteenth Century Ottoman Realities" in SI, XVI (1962).

İslam Ansiklopedisi, (İstanbul, 1940 -).

İz, Fahir, Eski Türk Edebiyatinda Nesir (İstanbul, 1964).

İz, Mahir, Tasavvuf, (İstanbul, 1969).

Ibn al-Jawzī, Abū 'l-Faraj, ʻAbd al-Raḥmān, Kitāb al-Quṣṣāṣ wa'l-Mudhakkırīn, ed. trans. Merlin L. Swartz, (Beirut, 1971).

Ibn al-Jawzı, Abu'l-Faraj ʻAbd al-Raḥmān, Talbīs Iblīs, (Damascus 1950).

Izutsu, Toshihiko, The Concept of Belief in Islamic Theology, (Tokyo, 1965).

God and Man in the Koran, (Tokyo, 1964).

The Key Philosophical Concepts in Sufism and Taoism, (Tokyo, 1967).

The Structure of the Ethical Terms in the Koran, (Montreal, 1966).

Jalāl Nūrī, Muqaddarāt Tārikhče, (İstanbul, 1331).

Jāmī, Abd-urrahmān Nūr-al-Dīn, Lawā'ih (A treatise on Sufism), trans. by E.H. Whinfield and M. Muhammad Kazvīnī, (London, 1978).

Jung, A.H., "Islamic Mysticism; Tasawwuf in theory and in practice," IC, 16 (1942), pp. 264-278.

'Islamic Mysticism," IC, 15 (1941), pp. 229-34.

Kaḥḥāla, ʻUmar Riḍā, Muʻjam al-Mu'allifīn, 15 vols. (Beirut, n.d.)

al-Kalabadhi, Abu Bakr M. ibn Ishaq, Kitab al-Taʻarruf, (Cairo, 1960).

Kāmil Pasha, Tārīkh Siyāsī dawlatı ʻaliyye-i ʻUthmaniyye 3 vols. (İstanbul, 1327).

Kara, Mustafa, Tekkeler ve Zaviyeler, (İstanbul, 1977).

Karahan, Abdükadīr, "Kendi el yazısı hātırātına göre Niyāzī-i Mısrī'nin hâzı mistik görüşleri" in Türkiyat Mecmuası, XIX (1977-79), pp. 93-98.

Karaman, Hayreddin, İslâmın Işığında Günün Meseleleri, (İstanbul, 1978).

Karatay, F.E., Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi Türkçe Yazmaları Kataloğu, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1961).

al-Kardawī, Yusūf, al-Ḥalāl wa'l-Ḥarām fi'l-Islām, (Beirut, 1973).

Kātip Çelebi; Hayatı ve eserleri hakkında incelemeler, (Ankara, 1957).

Kavakçı, Y.Z., Hisbe Teşkilātı, (Ankara, 1975).

Kaydu, E., Die Institution des Scheyh ul Islamat im Osmanischen Staat, (Nurnberg, 1971).

al-Kharrāz, Abū Sa'īd, Kitāb al-Ṣıdq, The book of truthfulness, ed. trans. by A.J. Arberry, (Calcutta, 1937).

al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī, Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, Mishkāt al-Maṣābīh, ed. Nāṣır al-Dīn al-Albānī, 3 vols. (Damascus, 1380).

Miskhāt al-Maṣābih. English translation with notes by J. Robson, 4 vols. (Lahore, 1972).

Ibn Khaldūn, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, Shifā' al-Sā'il li-tahdhīb al-masā'il, ed. b. Muhammad T. al-Tanji, trans. by S. Uludağ, Tasavvufun mahiyeti (İstanbul, 1977).

The Muqaddımah; an introduction to history. Trans. from the Arabic by F. Rosenthal, 3 vols.,(London, 1959).

Keddie, N.R. (ed.), Scholars, Saint and Sufis, (Los Angeles, 1972).

Keklik, Nihat, el-Futuhat al-Mekkiye (İstanbul, 1974).

Muhyiddin İbnül-'Arabī, hayatı ve Çevresi, (İstanbul, 1966).

Sadreddīn Korevī'nin Felsefesinde Allah, Kaināt ve İnsan, (İstanbul, 1966).

Khawāja-zāde, Aḥmad Ḥılmī, Ziyarāt-ı Awliyā'. (İstanbul, 1325).

Kerr, M., Islamic Reform, (Los Angeles, 1966).

Keskin, A., A critical edition of Enīsī's "Menāḳib-i Aḳ Şems ed-Dīn" with an account of Aḳ Şems ed-Dīn's political and religious influence as revealed in this work, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, (Manchester, 1977).

Ibn Khallikān, Wafāyāt al-A'yān, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1892).

Khān, Qamar al-Dīn, The Political Thought of Ibn Taymiyya, (Islāmabad, 1973).

Kissling, H.J. "Aus der Geschichte der Chalvetijje-ordens" in ZDMG, 102 (1953), pp. 233-319.

"Bedr al-Dīn" in EI², I, p. 869.

"Ṡa'bān Velī und die Ṡa'banijje" in Seria Monacensia, F. Babinger zum 15. Januar 1951 als Festgrube dargebracht, (Leiden, 1952).

"The sociological and educational role of the dervish orders in the Ottoman Empire", Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association, 76(1954), pp. 23-35.

"Zur Geschichte des Derwisch Ordens der Bajrāmijje ", in Sudostforschungen, XV (1956), 237 ff.

Klein, W. Al-Aš'arīs al-Ibānah 'an uṣūl ad-diyānah, (New Haven, 1940).

Kocatürk, M., Tekke Şiiri Antolojisi, (Ankara, 1955).

Koçu, R.E., Osmanlı Tarihinde Yasaklar, (İstanbul, 1950).

Tarihimizde garip vak'alar, (İstanbul, 1952).

Koray, Enver, Türkiye Tarih Yayınları Bibliyografyası, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1959-71).

Koyuncu Erkan, IV Murad Devri İlim Hayatı, İstanbul University, graduation thesis,(History) 1970, no. 1130.

Kömürcüyan, Eremya Çelebi, İstanbul Tarihi XVII asırda İstanbul, trans. by H.A. Andreasyan, (İstanbul, 1952).

Köprülü, F., Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar, (Ankara, 1966).

"Mısırda Bektaşilik" in Türkıyat Mecmuası VI (1939).

Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Kuruluşu, (Ankara, 1972).

Kramers, J.H., "İslam in Asia Minor" in Analecta Orientalia (Leiden, 1954).

"Shaykh al-Islām", in EI[1], IV, pp. 275-9.

"Lewend" in EI[1], III, p. 24.

Kunt, M., The Köprülü Years 1656-1661, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, (Princeton, 1971).

"Na'īmā, Köprülü and the Grand Vezirate" in Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi, (İstanbul, 1973), pp. 57-64.

Kufralı, Kasım, "Gülşenī" in İA, III, pp. 835-6.

"Molla ilāhi ve kendisinden sonraki Nakşibendiye Muhiti" in İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi, III (1949), pp. 129-51.

"Birgiwi" in EI[2], I, p. 1235.

"Birgivi" in İA, I, pp. 634-5.

Kurat, A.N., "The reign of Mehmed IV, 1648-87" in M. Cook (ed.) A History of the Ottoman Empire, (Cambridge).

Lane, E. W., The Modern Egyptians (New York, 1973).

Arabic-English Lexicon, 8 vols. (London, 1863-93).

Laoust, H. "Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal" in EI², I, pp. 272-77.

"L'influence d'Ibn-Taymiyya" in A.T. Welch and P. Cachia (edd.) Islam : Past Influence and Present Challenge, (Edinburgh, 1979).

Doctrines Sociales et Politiques d'Ibn Taimīya, (Cairo, 1939).

"Ibn Taymiyya" in EI², III, pp. 951-55.

Lammens, H., Islam; Beliefs and Institutions, (London, 1926).

Lerner, D. The Passing of Traditional Society, (Illinois, 1958).

Levend, A.S., "Dinī edebiyatımızın başlıca ürünleri" Türk Dili Araştırmaları yıllığı, Belleten (Ankara, 1972), pp. 72-

Levtzion, N. (ed.) Conversion to Islam, (New York - London, 1979).

Lewis, B. The Arabs in History (London, 1950).

"Daftardār" in EI², II, p. 83.

"Diwān-ı Humāyūn" in EI², II, pp. 337-8.

The Emergence of Modern Turkey (Oxford, 1961).

"Islam and the Ottoman Empire," in New Outlook, II (1959), pp. 3-7.

Islam from the Prophet Muhammad to the Capture of Constantinople, 2 vols. (London, 1979).

Islam in History, (London, 1973).

Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire, Norman University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.

"Some Reflections on the Decline of the Ottoman Empire", SI IX 1958.

Studies in Classical and Ottoman Islam, , London, 1976.

Lewis, B. (ed.) The World of Islam, (London, 1976).

Lewis, G.L. "Bàyrāmıyya" in EI², IV, p. 1137.

Lewis, R. Everyday Life in Ottoman Turkey, (London, 1971).

Levy, R. The Social Structure of Islam, (Cambridge, 1969), 2nd edition.

Levend, A.S., "Siyāset-nāmeler" in Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllıgı Belleten 1962/63, pp. 172-194.

Luṭfī, Aḥmad, Tārīkh-i Luṭfi, 8 vols. (İstanbul, 1290-1329).

Luṭfī, M., Tuhfat al-'Aṣrī fī Manāqıb al-Miṣrī, (Bursa, 1309).

Luṭfī, Pasha, Tewarīkhī Āl-ı 'Othmān, (İstanbul, 1341).

Lybyer, A.H., The government of the Ottoman Empire in the time of Suleiman the Magnificent, (Cambridge, 1913).

Madelung, W., "The Spread of Māturīdısm and the Turks" in Actas, pp. 109-68.

Maḥfūẓ, 'Alī, Al-ibdā' fī maḍārr al-Mubtada' (Cairo, 1956).

Ibn Māja, Muḥammad b. Yazīd, Sunan al-Muṣṭafā, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1349).

al-Makkī, Abū Ṭālib Muḥammad b. 'Alī, Qūṭ al-Qulūb, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1381).

Mala, S. Babs, "The Sufi convent and its social significance in the medieval period of Islam" in IC, 51 (1977), pp. 31-52.

Mālık b. Anas, al-Muwaṭṭa', (Cairo, n.d.)

Mandaville, J.E. "Usurious Piety : The cash waqf controversy in the Ottoman Empire" in IJMES, X (1979), pp. 289-308.

Mantran, R., "Aḥmad I", in EI², I, pp. 267-8.

İstanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIII siècle, (Paris, 1962).

Ibn Manẓūr, Muḥammad b. Mukarram, Lisān al-ʻArab, 20 vols. Cairo, 1300-1307.

Mardin, Şerif, "Power, civil society and culture in the Ottoman Empire" in Comparative Studies in Society and History (1969), pp. 258-81.

Margoliouth, D.S. "Ḳādırıyya" in EI², IV, pp. 380-3.

"Rifai" in EI¹, III, pp. 1156-7.

Marsot, A.L. al-Sayyıd, "The Ulama of Cairo in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" in N.R. Keddie (ed.) Scholars, Saints and Sufis,(Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 149-65.

Martin, B.G., "A short history of the Khalwati Order of dervishes" in N.R. Keddie (ed.), Scholars, Saints and Sufis (Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 275-305.

Massignon, L. "al-Ḥallādj" in EI², III, pp. 99-104.

"Ṭarīḳa" in EI¹, IV, pp. 667-72.

"Taṣawwuf", in EI¹, IV, pp. 681-85.

Mazzaoui, M. M., The Origins of the Ṣafawids, Shiʻism, Sufısm and the Gulāt, (Wiesbaden, 1972).

al-Māwardī, Abu'l-Ḥasan ʻAli b. Muḥammad, al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyya, trans. by A. Şafak, (İstanbul, 1976)

Ménage, V.L. "Čiwi-zāde" in EI², II, pp. 56-7.

"The İslamisation of Anatolia" in N. Levtzion (ed.) Conversion to Islam, (New York, 1979).

Menemencioğlu, N. The Penguin Book of Turkish Verse (London, 1978).

Merad, A., "Iṣlāḥ" in EI², IV, pp. 141-163.

Miller, B. "The curriculum of the palace school of the Turkish Sultan", in the Macdonald Presentation Volume, (Princeton, 1935), pp. 303-24.

al-Muḥāsibī, Abū ʿAbdullah Hārıth ibn Asad, Kitāb al-Ri'āya lihuqūq Allāh, ed. by M. Smith (London, 1940).

al-Muḥibbī, Muḥammad al-Amīn b. Faḍl Allāh, Khulāṣat al-Athar fī A'yān al-Qarn al-Ḥādī 'Ashar, 4 vols. Cairo, 1284.

Muḥyi'l-Dīn ibn 'Arabi, Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam, trans. by 'Aısha 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Tarjumana, (Norwich, 1980).

Mumcu, A., Dıvan-ı Humayun (Ankara, 1976).

Osmanlı Devletinde Rüşvet, (Ankara, 1969).

Osmanlı Devletinde Siyaseten Katl (Ankara, 1963).

Murphey, R. "The veliyyuddin Telhis : notes on the sources and interrelations between Koçi Bey and contemporary writers of advice to kings" in Belleten, 43 (1979), pp. 547-71.

Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn, al-Jami' al-Ṣaḥīḥ trans. by A.H. Ṣıddıqı, 4 vols. Lahore, 1978.

Muṣṭafā Nūrī Pasha, Netā'ij al-Wuqū'āt, 4 vols. (in 1) (İstanbul, 1327).

Müneccimbaşı Ahmet Dede, Müneccimbaşı Tarihi trans. by İsmail Erünsal, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1974).

Macdonald, D.B., The Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory, (London, 1915).

"Emotional Religion in Islam as affected by Music and Singing,' trans. of a book of the Iḥya' 'Ulūm al-Dīn" in part i JRAS 1901 (I, 195, 252) (II, 705-749); part ii JRAS 1902 (1-29).

Macdonald, D.B. "Māturīdī" in EI[1] III, pp. 414-15.

The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam, (Chicago, 1912).

Macdonald, D.B., Schacht, J. "Idjtihād" in EI[2], II, pp. 1026-27.

al-Nabhānī, Yusūf b. Ismā'īl, Sa'ādat al-darayn fī al-salāt 'alā sayyid al-kawnayn, (Beirut, 1316).

al-Nābulsī, 'Abd al-Ghānī, Kitāb al-hadīqa al-nadiyya sharh al-ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1290).

Naff, T. - Owen, R. Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History, (London and Amsterdam, 1977).

al-Nasā'ī, Aḥmad b. Shu'ayb, Sunan al-Nasā'ī, 8 vols., (Cairo, 1930)

Nasr, H., Ideals and Realities of Islam, (London, 1975).

al-Nawawī, Muḥyi' l-Dīn Yaḥyā b. Sharaf, al-Adhkār al-Muntakhaba min Kalām Sayyid al-Abrār, (Beirut, 1961)

Nicholson, R. A., The Idea of Personality in Sufism, (Cambridge, 1923).

Studies in Islamic Mysticism, (Cambridge, 1979).

The Mystics of Islam, (London, 1914).

Nagy, K., "Ḳaḍı" in EI[2], V, p. 375.

"Ḳaḍı 'Asker" in EI[2], V, p. 376.

Nishanji, Meḥmed Pasha, Tārikhī Nıshanji, (İstanbul, 1279).

Niẓām al-Mulk, Abū 'Alī Ḥasan b. Isḥāq, Siyasat-nama, trans. by H. Darke, The Book of Government or Rules for Kings, (London, 1978).

Nüzhet, S., Türk Musikisi Antolojisi, 2 vols. (İstanbul 1949).

Okyar, Osman, Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri (Ankara, 1975).

Orhonlu, C., "Ḳassām" in _EI_², IV, pp. 735-6.

"Khaṭṭ-ı' Humāyūn" in _EI_², IV, p. 1131.

"Murad Paşa Kuyucu", in _İA_, VIII, pp. 651-4.

Othmān-zāde, _Ḥadīqat al-Wuzarā'_, (İstanbul, 1271).

Özkaya, Yücel, "XVIII inci Yüzyılda Çıkarılan Adaletnāmelere göre Türkiye'nin iç durumu", in _Belleten_, 38 (1974), pp. 445-91.

Pakalın, M.Z. _Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü_, 3 vols. (İstanbul, 1946-56).

Parmaksızoğlu, İ., "Kemal Paşa-zāde" in _İA_, VI, pp. 561-566.

"Meḥmed IV" in _Türk Ansiklopedisi_, XXIII.

"Vanizāde Mehmet Efendi", in _Türk Ansiklopedisi_, XVIII, pp. 407-8.

Parry, V., "Enderun" in _EI_², II, pp. 697-8.

"The reign of Sulaimān the Magnificent, 1520-66" in Cook (ed.) _A History of the Ottoman Empire_, (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 79-102.

"The successors of Sulaimān, 1566-1617" in Cook, _op. cit._, pp. 103-132.

"The period of Murād IV, 1617-48" in Cook, _op. cit._, pp. 133-156.

Pedersen, J. "Masdjid" in _EI_¹, III, pp. 315-376.

"The Islamic Preacher" in S. Lowingern and J. Somogyi (edd.) _Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume_, (Budapest, 1948), I, pp. 220-51.

"The Criticism of the Islamic Preacher" in _Die Welt des Islams_, II, (1953), pp. 215-31.

Pickthall, M.M., _The Meaning of the Holy Qur'ān_, (Hyderabad, 1930).

Pixley, M.M., "The development and role of the Şeyhülıslam in early Ottoman history" in _JAOS_, 96. I. (1976), pp. 89-96.

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, Abū ʻAbd Allāh b. Abū Bakr, Ighāthat al-Lahfān min maṣāyid al-Shayṭān, 2 vols., (Cairo, 1961).

Qushayri, ʻAbd al Qāsım ʻAbdal Karīm Hawazin, Risāla fī ʻilm al-Taṣawwuf (Cairo, 1346).

Rahman, F., "Concepts Sunnah, İjtihād and İjmāʻ in the Early Period" in Islamic Studies, I (1962) pp. 5-21.

İslam, (London, 1966, 79).

Prophecy in Islam : Philosophy and Orthodoxy, (London, 1979).

"The post-formative developments in Islam" in Islamic Studies, 1 (1962), IV, pp. 1-23.

"Revival and Reform in Islam" in Cambridge History of Islam, II, p. 40.

"Sunnah and Ḥadīth" in Islamic Studies, 1 (1962), II, pp. 1-36.

Redhouse, J.W., A Turkish and English Lexicon, (Beirut, 1974).

Refiq, Aḥmad, Köprililer, (İstanbul, 1331).

Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı, (İstanbul, 1935).

Osmanlı Devrinde Hoca Nüfuzu, (İstanbul, 1935).

Qadınlar Salṭanatı, (İstanbul, 1927).

Samūr dewri, (İstanbul, 1927).

Repp, R.C., "The altered nature and role of the ulema" in T.Naff and R. Owen (edd.), Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History, (London, Amsterdam, 1977.

An Examination of the Origins and Development of the Office of Shaikh al-Islām, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Oxford, 1966 .

Repp, R.C., "Some observations on the development of the Ottoman learned hierarchy" in N.R. Keddie (ed.), Scholars, Saints and Sufis, (Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 17-32.

Rieu, C., Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum, (London, 1888).

Rif'at Efendi, Dawḥat al-Mashāyikh ma'a dhayl, (İstanbul, n.d.).

Robson, J., "Bid'a" in EI², IV, p. 1199.

Rogers, J.M.L., "al-Ḳāhira" in EI², IV, pp. 424-41.

Rosenthal, F. Humor in Early Islam, (West Port, 1976).

Knowledge Triumphant, (Leiden, 1970).

Rosenthal, E.I.J., Islam in the Modern National State, (Cambridge, 1965).

Political Thought in Medieval Islam, (Cambridge, 1958).

Rūmī, Jalāl al-Dīn, Discourses of Rūmī, trans. by A.J. Arberry, (London, 1961).

Mathnawī, ed. trans. and annotated by R.A. Nicholson, 8 vols. (London, 1925-40).

Rycaut, P., The Present State of the Ottoman Empire, (London, 1668).

Salih, Muḥammad Oṣman, Intercession in Islam and Christianity, unpublished M. Litt. Edinburgh, 1970.

Ṣāliḥ, M. Ummsalma, The Political Thought of Ibn Taymiyya, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh, 1980.

Sāmī, Shams al-Dīn, Qāmūs al-A'lām, 6 vols., (İstanbul, 1306-16).

Sandys, G., Description of the Turkish Empire, (Amsterdam, 1973).

al-Sarrāj, Abū Naṣr, Kitāb al-Luma' fi'l-Taṣawwuf, ed. R.A. Nicholson (London, 1914).

Sarı, Meḥmed Pasha, Ottoman Statecraft, trans. with notes by W.L. Wright, (Princeton, 1935).

Schacht, J., "Abū Ḥanīfa", in EI², I, pp. 123-4.

"Abu 'l-Su'ūd" in EI², I, p. 152.

An Introduction to Islamic Law, (Oxford, 1979).

Schimmel, A., Mystical Dimensions of Islam, (Berkeley, 1976).

"Sufi Literature" in Afghanistan 29 (1976), pp. 76-87.

The Triumphal Sun, A study of works of Jalālloddin Rumi, (London, 1980).

Scholem, G. Sabbatai Ṣevi The Mystical Messiah, (London, 1973).

Selānikî, Muṣṭafā, Tārīkh-i Selānikī, (İstanbul, 1281).

Sell, E., Religious Orders of Islam, (London, 1908).

Sertoğlu, Mithat, "Tuği Tarihi" in Belleten, XI (1947), pp. 489-514.

al-Shāṭibī, Abū Isḥaq Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā, al-I'tiṣām, 2 vols., (Beirut, n.d.)

Shaw, S.J., History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Vol. I : Empire of the Gazis : The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808, (Cambridge, 1977).

Shawkānī, Muḥammad b. 'Alī, Nayl al-Awṭār, 8 vols., (Cairo, 1357).

Tuhfat al-Dhākirīn, (Egypt, 1955).

Shinder, J., "Early Ottoman Administration in the Wilderness : some limits on comparison" in IJMES, IX (1978), pp. 497-517.

Shukrī, Muhammed, The Mystical Doctrine of Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī as Found in his Book Qūṭ al-Qulūb, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh, 1976.

Slane, Mac Guckin De, Ibn Khallikan's Biographical Dictionary, (Paris, 1841-1871).

Smith, T. and Rays, J., A Collection of Curious Travels and Voyages, (London, 1738).

Smith, M. Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East, (London, 1931).

Smith, W.C., The meaning and end of religion, (London, 1978).

Sobotta, H., Das Amt des Kadi im Osmanischen Reich, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, (Munster, 1954).

Sohrweide, H., "Der Sieg der Safaviden in Persien und seine Rückwirkungen auf die Schiiten Anatoliens im 16. Jahrhundert" in Der Islam, XLI (1965), pp. 95-223.

Sugar, F., Southern Europe Under Ottoman Rule, (Seattle, 1977).

Suhrawardī, Abū al-Najīb, Kitāb ādāb al-Murīdīn, trans. M. Milson. A Sufi rule for novices (Cambridge, 1975).

Suhrawardī, Shihāb al-Dīn, Kitāb 'Awārif al-Ma'ārif, (Egypt, 1939).

al-Sulāmī, Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān, Kitāb Ādāb al-Ṣuhba, M.J. Kister (ed.) (Jerusalem, 1954).

Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfiyya, J. Pedersen (ed.) (Leiden, 1960).

al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān, al-Rasā'il al-tis'a, (Hyderabad, 1961).

Şimşek, M., Les Controverses sur la Bid'a en Turquie de Selim I à Meḥmed IV, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Sorbonne, 1977.

Taeschner, F., "Akhī" in EI², I, pp. 321-3.

"Islām Ortaçağında Futuvva (Fütüvvel-Teşkilâtı)" in İİFM, XV (1954), pp. 3-32.

Ṭāhir, Meḥmed, 'Othmānlı Mü'ellifleri, 3 vols. (İstanbul, 1334-43).

Taḥralı, Muṣṭafā Aḥmad, al-Rifā'i (512-578 - 118-1182), Savie, son œuvre et sa ṭarīqa, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Sorbonne, Paris, 1973.

Tansel, F.A. "Olanlar Şeyhī İbrahim Efendi ve Devriyesi" in İFD, XVII (1969), pp. 187-99.

"Seyyid 'Azız Mahmud Hudāyi" in İFD, XV (1967) pp. 1-42.

Tansel, Selâhattin, Yavuz Sultan Selim, (Ankara, 1969).

Tashköprü-zāde, Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā, Miftāḥ al-Sa'āda wa Miṣbaḥ al-Siyāda, 3 vols., (İstanbul, 1356).

Shaqā'iq al-Nu'maniyya, (İstanbul, 1852).

Tāwīl, Tawfīq, Al-Taṣawwuf fi Miṣr Ibbān al-'asr al-'Uthmānī (Cairo, 1946).

Ibn Taymiyya, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad, Al-amr bi'l-ma'rūf wa'l nahy 'an al-munkar, (Cairo, 1968).

Al-Furqān bayn Awliyā' al-Raḥmān wa-Awliyā' al-Shayṭān, (Cairo, 1958).

al-Ḥisba fi'l-Islām, (Damascus, 1967).

Majmū'at Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyya, 30 vols., (Riyāḍ, 1381 A.H.)

Majmū'at al-Rasā'il al-Kubrā, 4 vols., (Cairo, 1323 A.H.).

Majmū'at al-Rasā'il wa'l-Masā'il, 2 vols., (Cairo).

Ibn Taymiyya, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad, Qā'ida Jalīla fī al-Tawassul wa'l-Wasīla, (Cairo, 1345).

al-Siyāsa al-Shar'iyya fī iṣlāh al-Rā'ī wa'l-Ra'ıyya, (Cairo, 1952).

Su'āl fī Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya, (Beirut, 1976).

Thaqıb Dede, Sefine-ı Mawlawiyya (İstanbul 1283).

Tsehudi, R., Bektāshiyā, in EI², I, p. 1137.

Thévenot, N., The Travels into the Levant
1971

Thomas, L.V., A Study of Naima, ed. N. Itzkowitz, (New York, 1972).

Thurayyā, Meḥmed, Sijill-i Othmānī, 4 vols., (İstanbul, 1308, 1315).

Togan, Zeki Velidī, Tarihte Usūl (İstanbul, 1950).

Trimingham, J. S. "The formative stages of the Islamic religious orders" in Transactions of the Glasgow Oriental Society, 1960, pp. 65-77.

The Sufi Orders in Islam, (Oxford, 1971).

Turan Osman, Selçuklular Tarihi ve Türk İslam Medeniyeti (Ankara, 1965).

———— Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye, (İstanbul, 1971).

Turner, S., Weber and Islam, (London, 1974).

al-Ṭurtushī, A., Kitāb al-Hawadith wa'l-Bid'a, M. Talbi (ed.), (Tunis, 1950).

al-Ṭūṣī, Abū Naṣr 'Abdallāh b. 'Alī al-Sarrāj, The Kitāb al-Luma' fi'l-Taṣawwuf Ed. Reynold, A. Nicolson, (London, 1914).

Ṭūṣī, N., The Nasırean Ethics, trans. by G.M. Wickins, (London, 1964).

Tveritinova, A.S., 'Social ideas in Turkish didactic politico-economic Treatises' in Papers presented by the USSR delegation to the XXV International Congress of Orientalists, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1960), pp. 402-9.

Ubicini, J. H. A. Letters on Turkey, trans. from French by Lady Easthope, 2 parts, London, 1836.

Uğur, A., The Ottoman 'Ulemā in the Mid-17th Century : An Analysis of the Vakā'i'ü'l-füzalā of Mehmed Şeyhī Ef., unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh University, 1973.

Ülgener, Sabri, Iktisādī inhitat Tarihimizin Ahlāk ve Zihniyet Meseleleri, (İstanbul, 1951).

Ülken, H.Z., "Kātip Çelebi ve fikir hayatımız", in Kātib Çelebi, hayati ve eserleri, (Ankara, 1957), pp. 177-93.

Uluçay, C., "IV Murad ve Tütün Yasağı" in Tarih Dünyası, 35, (İstanbul, 1952).

"Tütün ve Kahveye Dair" in Gediz, 45, (Manisa, 1941).

"Koçi Bey'in Sultan İbrahime takdim ettiği risale ve arzları" in (Zeki Velidi Togan'a Armağan) Symbolae in Honorem Z.V. Togan, (İstanbul, 1950-55), pp. 177-99.

Saruhan'da eşkiyalık ve halk hareketleri : XVII Asırda, (İstanbul, 1944).

Uludağ, S., İslām Açısından Müsıkî ve semā, (İstanbul, 1976).

İslām Düşüncesinin yapısı; selef, kelām tasavvuf, felsefe, (İstanbul, 1979).

Ünver, S., "Türkiye de Kahvenin 400 yıldönümü" in Tarih Mecmuası (İstanbul, 1950ı.

al-Uthaymīn, A.S., Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb : The Man and his Works, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh, 1973.

Uysal, M., Mülteka Tercümesi, 4 vols., (İstanbul, 1974).

Uzunçarşılı, İ.H., "Bostāndji" in EI^2, I, pp. 1277-8.

"Bostāndji-Bashi, in EI^2, I, pp. 1278-9.

"Çorbadji" in EI^2, II, pp. 61-2

Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilātından Kapı Kulu Ocakları, 2 vols., (Ankara, 1943).

Osmanlı Tarihi, 4 vols. (Ankara, 1949-1959).

Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilātı, (Ankara, 1965).

Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilātı, (Ankara, 1948).

Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilātına Medhal, (İstanbul, 1941).

Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilātı, (Ankara, 1945).

Voll, J., "The non wahhābī Hanbalis of eighteenth century Syria" in Der Islam, 49 (1972), pp. 277-29.

Von Hammer, P. Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, (Wien, 1829),

Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman depuis son origine jusqu' à nos jours.., Tr. par. J.J. Hellert, (Paris, 1835-45) vols. X, XI,

Dawlati 'Othmānīya Tārīkhi, tr. Meḥmed 'Aṭā (İstanbul, 1377), vol. X and

Osmanli Devleti Tarihi, Tr. Mehmet 'Atâ, (İstanbul, 1947).

Vryonis, S. Jr., The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh Through the Fifteenth Century, (Berkeley, 1971).

"Nomadization and Islamization in Asia Minor" in Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 29(1975), pp. 41-73.

Walsh, J.R., "Fatwā" in EI², III, pp. 866-7.

"Kātib Chelebi, Mizānü'l-Ḥaḳḳ : Notes and corrections to a translation" in IQ, 5 (1959), pp. 63-79.

"The Turkish manuscripts in New College, Edinburgh" in Oriens XII (1952), pp. 171-89.

Watt, W.M., "al-Ash'arī, Abu'l-Ḥasan" in EI², I, pp. 694-5.

Islam and the Integration of Society, (London, 1961).

The Formative Period of Islamic Thought, (Edinburgh, 1973).

Islamic Philosophy and Theology, (Edinburgh, 1962).

Islamic Political Thought; the basic concepts, (Edinburgh, 1968).

Muhammad at Mecca, (Oxford, 1953).

Muhammad at Madina, (Oxford, 1956).

Muslim Intellectual; a study of al-Ghazālī, (Edinburgh, 1963).

Wensinck, A.J., Concordance et indices de la traditions musulmane, 7 vols., (Leiden, 1936-1969).

A Handbook of Early Muslim Tradition, (Leiden, 1927).

"Lawḥ" in EI¹, III, pp. 19-20.

The Muslim Creed (London, 1979).

White, G.E., "Saint Worship in Turkey" in Muslim World, 9(1919), pp. 8-18.

Wittek, P., The Rise of the Ottoman Empire, (London, 1958).

Wijdānī, Ṣādiq, Ṭomār-ı Ṭuruq ʻAliyye Khalwatıyye, (İstanbul, 1922).

Ṭomār-ı Ṭuruq ʻAliyye Malāmīlik, (İstanbul, 1921).

Ṭomār-ı Ṭuruq ʻAliyye Qādiriyya, (İstanbul, 1921).

Wolfson, H.A., The Philosophy of Kalam, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1976).

Waardenburgh, J. "Official and Popular Religion in Islam" in Social Compass XXV (1978), pp. 315-40.

Yaman, K., "XV ve XVI asırlarda Osmanlı İlmiyesi ve İlmiye Teşkilatı" in Gerçek, 7 (Istanbul, 1974), pp. 5-38.

Yazıcı, Tahsin, "Gulshani" in EI[2], II, pp. 1136-7.

Ibrahim Gülşeni hayatı ve eserleri, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Dil, Tarih ve Coğrafya Fakültesi,

Ibrahim Gülşeni ve Tarikatı, Istanbul University, graduation dissertation (Turkology), 1945, no. 1124.

"Ḳalandarıyya" in EI[2], IV, pp. 473-4.

"Nakşıbend" in İA, IX, pp. 53-4.

"Semāʻ" in İA, X (İstanbul, 1972), p. 464.

Yazıcıoğlu, M. Sait, Le Kalām et son Rôle Dans la société Turco-Ottomane, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Paris, 1977.

Yüksel, Emrullah, Les idées religieuses et politiques de Meḥmed al-Birkéwi (929-81/1523-73), unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Paris, 1972.

"Mehmet Birgivī (929-981/1523-1573)" in Atatürk Universitesi İslâmī İlimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 2 (1977), pp. 175-185.

Yurd, Ali İhsan, Akşemseddin, (İstanbul, 1972).

Yurdaydın, H.G., İslām Tarihi Dersleri, (Ankara, 1971).

"Türkiye'nin dinī tarihine umumî bir bakış" in İFD, IX (1961), pp. 109-120.

"Üstüvanî Risālesi" in IFD, X (1962), pp. 71-78.

"Ḳābıḍ" in EI², V, pp. 333-4.

al-Zamakhsharī, Maḥmūd b. 'Umar, Tafsīr al-Kashshāf, 4 vols., (Cairo, 1381).

al-Zirikli, Khayr al-Dīn, al-A'lām, 15 vols., (Cairo, 1373).